REPORT RESUMES

ED 003 035 24
OWN AND ATTRIBUTED COGNITIONS FOR THE TEACHER. VOLUME
5--STUDIES IN THE ROLE OF THE PUBLIC SCHOOL TEACHER.
BY- BIDDLE, BRUCE J. AND OTHERS
MISSOURI UNIV., COLUMBIA
REPORT NUMBER CRP-1082-VOL. 5 PUB DATE FEB 61
MISSOURI UNIV., KANSAS CITY
EDRS PRICE MF-$0.18 HC-$4.40 110P.

DESCRIPTORS- *TEACHER ROLE, PUBLIC SCHOOLS, TEACHER RECRUITMENT, *ROLE CONFLICTS, TEACHERS, PARENTS, SCHOOL PERSONNEL, COLLEGE STUDENTS, *COGNITIVE MEASUREMENT, COMMUNITY ATTITUDES, *ROLE THEORY, COLUMBIA, MISSOURI, KANSAS CITY

A SERIES OF INVESTIGATIONS WAS CONDUCTED TO COLLECT DATA ABOUT TEACHER ROLE COGNITIONS. ROLE COGNITIONS STUDIED INCLUDED TEACHER ROLE COGNITIONS HELD AND COGNITIONS ATTRIBUTED TO OTHERS. INITIALLY DATA WERE OBTAINED FROM A PILOT STUDY OF OVER 100 UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS IN AN URBAN UNIVERSITY. ADDITIONAL DATA WERE OBTAINED FROM APPROXIMATELY 700 RESPONDENTS REPRESENTING 7 COMMUNITY POSITIONS IN A MAJOR METROPOLITAN AREA AND FROM ADDITIONAL STUDENT RESPONSES OBTAINED FROM APPROXIMATELY 250 STUDENTS DIVIDED EVENLY BETWEEN EDUCATION AND NONEDUCATION MAJORS. ROLE COGNITIONS HELD BY RESPONDENTS AND ATTRIBUTED TO OTHERS WERE THEN RELATED. SIGNIFICANT AND SYSTEMATIC DIFFERENCES WERE REPORTED BETWEEN COGNITIONS AND THOSE ATTRIBUTED TO SCHOOL OFFICIALS, TEACHERS, AND PEOPLE IN GENERAL. PRIOR AND SUBSEQUENT STUDIES AND PROCEDURES WERE REFERENCED ED 002 851, ED 003 034, ED 003 036, AND ED 002 986. (WN)

OWN AND ATTRIBUTED COGNITIONS FOR THE TEACHER

by

Bruce J. Biddle,
Project Director

Howard A. Rosencranz,
Research Associate

and

Earl F. Rankin, Jr.,
Research Associate

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE
Office of Education
This document has been reproduced exactly as received from the person or organization originating it. Points of view or opinions stated do not necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

Volume 5 - STUDIES IN THE ROLE OF THE PUBLIC SCHOOL TEACHER

Social Psychology Laboratory
The University of Missouri
Columbia
February 1961

Conducted Under Contracts with the Cooperative Research Program
Office of Education
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare

at

The University of Kansas City and The University of Missouri

ED003035

Initial distribution of this report has been made to the Cooperative Research Program of the Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; and copies of it may be obtained on loan from depository libraries of the program.

Additional copies may be purchased from The University of Missouri Press, Building T-2, The University of Missouri, Columbia, Missouri.

Acknowledgments

Many other persons in addition to the authors have helped in the project partially reported here. Although not in any way responsible for the findings or their interpretation, thanks are due to Egon Guba and Neal Gross for assistance during the planning phase. Virginia Calkins, Harriett Guthrie, Marjorie Ryckman, Ealeen Sentner, Jack Siegler, Edward Tomich, J. Paschal Twyman, and F. Neil Willis served as Graduate Assistants at one time or another. A large group of graduate students at The University of Kansas City have served as interviewers and interviewing assistants; while others, particularly Ellen H. Biddle, have held responsibilities for coding. Our thanks should also go to the many public school educators in the Kansas City metropolitan area for their cooperation and assistance in making the project possible; while inestimable help was provided throughout the first two project years by Dean Hugh W. Speer and the faculty of the School of Education, University of Kansas City. We are also indebted to Ruth Addison and Carol Freeman for typing the manuscript.

FOREWORD

In July 1958, a program of research on the role of the public school teacher was inaugurated at The University of Kansas City. This program has had three broad objectives:

1. To pursue role theory and aid in its development as a sophisticated system of analysis in social psychology.
2. To study extensively and empirically the role of the public school teacher.
3. To explore the relationships between teacher role and the problems of teacher recruitment.

These objectives have required a variety of activities. To date, staff members have engaged in: (a) The development of a consistent set of terms and distinctions applicable to role theory; (b) The systematic review of the published literature on role theory and on empirical studies of educational roles; (c) The development of a methodology applicable to the study of roles; and (d) The collection of interview data from respondents in the Kansas City metropolitan area in three field studies covering aspects of the role of the public school teacher.

In part, this research program has been supported by the Cooperative Research Program of the Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare through two research contracts, one granted to the University of Kansas City and one granted to the University of Missouri to which the project moved in September 1960.

This volume is one of several which are submitted to the Cooperative Research Program as a Final Report. It is concerned with relating role cognitions which respondents themselves hold for public school teachers to those which they attribute to others. We are able to show significant and systematic differences between own cognitions and those attributed to school officials, people in general, and to teachers themselves. Findings are presented from three independent sources: A Pilot Study of roles held by educational students; A Role Study based upon community respondents; and also from the Role Study additional responses from a second sample of college students. Findings are interpreted for both role theory and the role of the public school teacher.

Other Final Report volumes are also available from this research program. These are organized into two series. The numerical series deals with findings from our empirical investigations of teacher role in Kansas City. The alphabetic series is concerned with role theory, methods and bibliographic reviews. A general outline of reports, either already available or in preparation, is provided in Figure i.i on the following page.

Some materials within this volume will assume a prior acquaintance with Volume 1 - Orientation, Methods and Materials (see Figure i.i). Whereas the casual reader will find that this volume may be read for findings and interpretation, the serious reader who is concerned with methods, assumptions and samples is urged to acquire a prior familiarization with Volume 1. Or better yet, to keep it handy while reading this volume.

Bruce J. Biddle
Howard A. Rosencranz
Earl F. Rankin, Jr.
January 1961

GENERAL OUTLINE - STUDIES IN THE ROLE OF THE PUBLIC SCHOOL TEACHER

Series I - THEORETICAL, METHODOLOGICAL AND BIBLIOGRAPHIC STUDIES

A - *Role Theory and the Methods of Role Analysis*

B - *Bibliographies on Role Terms, Role Conflict, and the Role of the Teacher**

C - *A Program for the Processing of Ordinal Data and Computation of Significance for Selected Central Tendency Differences**

D - *Bibliographies on Role Methodology and Propositions*

Series II - EMPIRICAL REPORTS

1 - *Orientation, Methods and Materials**

2 - *General Characteristics of the School Teacher's Role*

3 - *Positional Differences in Teacher Role*

4 - *Role of the Teacher and Occupational Choice*

5 - *Own and Attributed Cognitions for the Teacher**

6 - *Type of Community and Role of the Teacher*

Figure i.1

---

*Studies marked with an asterisk are presently available. Unmarked studies are in preparation. Additional empirical reports (not listed) will aso be prepared during 1961.

Table of Contents

Page

Foreword i

Table of Contents iv

List of Tables and Figures vi

Chapter I - INTRODUCTION

The Problem 1

A Short Summary of Distinctions 1
    Expectations and Norms 2
    Aspects of Cognition 2
    Backgrounds 3
    Own and Attributed Cognitions 4
    Respondent Position 5

The Meaning of Cognitive Disparities 5
    Implications for Teacher Role 5
    Implications for Role Theory 6

The Three Studies 8
    The Pilot Study 8
    The Role Study 11

Methods of Analysis 13

Limitations upon these Findings 15

Chapter II - OWN AND ATTRIBUTED COGNITIONS FOR TEACHERS HELD BY COLLEGE STUDENTS - RESULTS FROM THE PILOT STUDY

Introduction 17

Tables of Results 17

Findings 25
    General Findings .25
    Expectations and Norms 27
    Findings for Sentient Object Groups 31
    Findings for Teacher Characteristics 33

Summary 35

Chapter III - OWN AND ATTRIBUTED COGNITIONS FOR TEACHER HELD BY THE COMMUNITY

Introduction 39

Tables of Results 39

Page
Findings 45
General Findings 45
Teacher Control of Pupils 49
Self-Indulgence 51
Community Participation 53
Non-Teaching Maintenance Functions 54

Summary 54

Chapter IV - OWN AND ATTRIBUTED COGNITIONS FOR TEACHERS HELD BY STUDENTS - RESULTS FROM THE ROLE STUDY

Introduction 57

Tables of Results .57

Findings 61
General Findings 61
Teacher Control of Pupils 65
Self-Indulgence 71
Community Activities 71
Maintenance Functions 73

Summary 74

Chapter V - RESULTS AND THEIR IMPLICATIONS

Introduction 77

Summary of Findings 77
General Findings 79
Findings for Sentient Object Groups 85
Differences among Types of Cognition 87
Teacher Characteristics 88
Respondent Groups .88
Content Areas of Teacher Role 89
Measuring Instrument Differences 89

Implications of the Results 90
For Role Theory 90
For the Role of the Teacher 93

Recommendations 95

References 97

List of Tables and Figures

Number	Title	Page
i.i	General Outline - Studies in the Role of the Public School Teacher	iii
2.1	Median Normative Ratings	18
2.2	Median Expectational Ratings	22
2.3	Number of Significant Differences Between Attributed and Own Norms (for all teacher characteristics)	26
2.4	Number of Significant Differences Between Attributed and Own Norms for Teacher Entrance into Settings	26
2.5	Number of Significant Differences Between Attributed and Own Norms for Teacher Behaviors	28
2.6	Number of Significant Differences Between Attributed and Own Norms for Teacher Traits	28
2.7	Number of Significant Differences Between Attributed and Own Expectations (for all teacher characteristics)	30
2.8	Number of Significant Differences Between Attributed and Own Expectations for Teacher Entrance into Settings	30
2.9	Number of Significant Differences Between Attributed and Own Expectations for Teacher Behaviors	32
2.10	Number of Significant Differences Between Attributed and Own Expectations for Teacher Traits	32
2.11	Number of Significant Differences Between Own and Attributed Norms by Sentient Object Group and Characteristic	34
2.12	Number of Significant Differences Between Own and Attributed Expectations by Sentient Object Group and Characteristic	34
2.13	Relationship Between Median Own Norm and Median Own Expectation Ratings	36
3.1	Community Means for Own and Attributed Cognitions for Public School Teacher Behaviors	40
3.2	Numbers of Significant Differences Between Own and Attributed Cognitions Held by the Community	44
3.3	Significant Differences Between Attributed and Own Cognitions for Test and Study Supervision	44
3.4	Significant Differences Between Attributed and Own Cognitions for Deviancy Control	46
3.5	Significant Differences Between Attributed and Own Cognitions for the Maintenance of Order	46
3.6	Significant Differences Between Attributed and Own Cognitions for Structuring	48
3.7	Significant Differences Between Attributed and Own Cognitions for Self-Indulgence	48
3.8	Significant Differences Between Attributed and Own Cognitions for Community Participation	50
3.9	Significant Differences Between Attributed and Own Cognitions for Non-Teaching Maintenance Functions	50

List of Tables and Figures (Contd)

Number	Title	Page
4.1	Student Means for Own and Attributed Cognitions for Public School Teacher Behaviors (Pilot Study Behavior)	58
4.2	Numbers of Significant Differences Between Own and Attributed Cognitions Held by the Community	62
4.3	Significant Differences Between Attributed and Own Cognitions for Deviancy Control	62
4.4	Significant Differences Between Attributed and Own Cognitions for Supervision and the Maintenance of Order	64
4.5	Significant Differences Between Attributed and Own Cognitions for "Gratuitous" Control Duties	66
4.6	Significant Differences Between Attributed and Own Cognitions for Structuring	66
4.7	Significant Differences Between Attributed and Own Cognitions for Threats and General Discipline	68
4.8	Significant Differences Between Attributed and Own Cognitions for Self-Indulgence	68
4.9	Significant Differences Between Attributed and Own Cognitions for Community Activities	70
4.10	Significant Differences Between Attributed and Own Cognitions for Non-teaching Maintenance Functions	72
4.11	Significant Differences Between Attributed and Own Cognitions for Teaching-Related Maintenance Functions	72
5.1	General Findings	78
5.2	Findings for Students as Sentient Objects	80
5.3	Findings for Teachers as Sentient Objects	80
5.4	Findings for People in General and Parents as Sentient Objects	82
5.5	Findings for School Officials as Sentient Objects	84

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The Problem

The role of the public school teacher is commonly defined in terms of the behavior patterns characteristic of teachers. However, due to the obvious difficulties involved in making direct behavioral observations of teachers, most teacher role studies have used the indirect procedure of asking people what they think teachers do or what they would like or dislike for them to be doing. Examples of such studies may be found in Lewis 1/, Fishburn 2/, McGill 3/, and Yourglich 4/. Some investigators, on the other hand, have used a still more indirect approach which consisted of asking subjects what they think other people expect or want of teachers. Examples of this latter approach may be found in Callaway 5/, Cook, et al. 6/, Lane 7/, and Manwiller 8/.

There is obviously nothing intrinsically "incorrect" about either type of study. Indeed, we would presume that persons who were in interaction with teachers would utilize both kinds of cognitive information in making decisions about behavior. Unfortunately, however, various investigators have neglected to differentiate between these two types of phenomena - or, worse, have presumed that either (or both) was an adequate reflection of actual teacher behavior.

The studies appearing in this volume report a series of empirical investigations into the role cognitions held about teachers and those attributed to others for teachers. We will show that these two types of role elements are systematically and significantly different from one another, and that these differences are related to type of cognition, reference group to whom role cognitions are attributed, persons holding roles for the teacher, and teacher aspects under discussion. Applications of these findings to an understanding of teacher role are discussed, and implications for role theory are explored.

A Short Summary of Distinctions

A brief summary of terminological distinctions which will be made in this volume is given here for the casual reader. The more serious student is referred to Volume A of this series 9/ for a thorough discussion of the terms and concepts of role theory and their application to educational problems.

Expectations and Norms. The cognitions which are held about teachers may be categorized upon the basis of several distinctions. One such distinction is made between expectations and norms. An expectation is a belief concerning the characteristics or behaviors most likely to be manifested by a person or position. For example, one might hold the expectation that most teachers are friendly people, or that few teachers behave sadistically. Expectations tell us nothing about the values which people place upon these characteristics or behaviors. Indeed, they also tell us nothing about actual teacher behavior unless we can assume that the expectation reported is accurate or veridical.

If we wish to study values, we must study norms. A norm is a value-oriented cognition about the characteristics or behaviors of a person or position. For example, one might hold the norm that teachers should be friendly or that teachers should not behave sadistically. Once again, norms tell us nothing about the beliefs which people hold about characteristics or behaviors, and again tell us nothing about teacher behavior.

The study of expectations for teachers should tell us something about stereotypes which people hold about teachers, for, in the absence of direct perceptual information, all people must behave towards others in terms of their beliefs about the world. The study of norms should tell us about standards, about basic issues of morality in relation to teachers. We assume that teacher role is made up of both norms and expectations held for teachers.

Aspects of Cognition. A second distinction must be made between cognitions held about various aspects or characteristics of teachers. For this purpose we distinguish between behaviors, traits and presence in physical settings. The term behavior refers to any overt action being carried out by a teacher. Behaviors are, thus, overt, transitory, volitional, molar, and may (or may not) be directed towards others in the immediate vicinity. Behaviors may, of course, vary in molarity from such inclusive units as "teaching English", to such minute elements as "erasing the blackboard". Nevertheless, a behavior is always a description of what the teacher is doing. Considering the transitory nature of behaviors, it is no wonder that most social observers have discovered that the behaviors of a person change rapidly as he goes from one situation to another. Teachers, for instance, behave differently on the play-ground, in the classroom, and in the home.

Obviously not all characteristics of teachers are behavioral. Such aspects as age, sex, skin and eye color, and the shape of the ears are relatively permanent, non-volitional, and non-directed. Nevertheless, cognitions may also be maintained about these latter characteristics, which we refer to as features. We assert that on the level of overt characteristics, only two types of teacher aspects may be said to constitute the role of the teacher - behaviors and features.

Despite the fact that behaviors tend to alter radically from situation to situation, respondents tend to view the behavior of a person or position as possessing common elements which are not bounded by the situation. Thus, we often hear that teachers are "kind", or "mousy". Such descriptions constitute one kind of trait which may be defined as any cognitively identified aspect of a person or position which is presumed to be independent of background. Various types of traits may be identified in the common language. Features are, of course, viewed as traits; for example, "Teachers are women". "Frozen" patterns of behavior become traits; "Teachers talk too much". Motivations, attitudes, abilities, and other hypothetical constructs standing behind behavior are also traits. All of these elements are alike in that they represent a description of the person or position which is presumed to be independent of context; all are defined at the cognitive rather than overt level.

Backgrounds. A physical setting is simply one kind of situational context in which a respondent may hold expectations or norms for teacher characteristics. As Barker and Wright 10/ have shown, physical settings not only attract certain classes of persons but also appear to generate certain patterns of behavior in those persons who enter them. Thus, pupils may be found running on the grounds and walks around a school building but not in the classrooms and ordinarily not in the halls. Physical settings are not the only type of context in which behavior is judged, however. Social situations, such as the distinction between a spelling lesson, music period and study hall (all of which may be conducted in the same classroom and involve the same participants) also determine behavior. So do the time of day, the positional affiliation of the persons present, physical characteristics of the environment such as light and heat, and serialized patterns of social interaction. An example of the latter is the "deviancy control incident" in which a teacher identifies a pupil who is out of line and then stops the ongoing activity in order to reestablish control. Systematic study of these various types of backgroups, their relationships, their effects upon overt behavior, and their dominance in roles held for the teacher (or others) have yet to be made. In the studies to be reported here we have used presence in physical settings as a context to be explored and have asked for norms and expectations regarding mere teacher presence. We have also used both physical settings and social situations as contexts in which to study norms and expectations for more specific teacher behaviors.

Own and Attributed Cognitions. A third important distinction must be made between role elements which are held by respondents attributed to others, attributed cognitions. For example, a respondent gives his own norm for teacher behavior, "I disapprove of teachers speaking out too strongly at PTA meetings"; and then he attributes a contrasting norm to school officials, "But school officials are very much in favor of teachers speaking out". It should be noted that in the attributed cognition there are three people involved: (1) The respondent himself. (2) The person or position for whom the cognition is held (in this case, the teacher). (3) The person or position to whom the cognition is attributed. This latter group we shall call the sentient object, although it has sometimes been referred to as a "reference group" (which also has several other meanings).

Once again, attention should be called to the independence of own and attributed cognitions. There is no reason why teacher behavior, own norms (about that behavior), own expectations, attributed norms, or attributed expectations must coincide. Indeed, it would be surprising if they all did. And we would presume that norms and expectations attributed to one sentient object group (let us say, school officials) would tend to be different from norms attributed to another sentient object group (such as parents).

Respondent Position. Finally, it must be noted that respondents, too, belong to positions bearing distinct functional relationships with that of teacher. There is no a priori reason to suggest that the norms and expectations held about teachers by school officials, by parents, by students of education, or by the community in general are identical. Indeed, each group has unique experiences and needs, and we would be surprised to discover absolute unanimity of beliefs or values. But there must be a minimum of agreement in both areas or the social system of the school will fall apart.

The Meaning of Cognitive Disparities

Within a normally operating social system it is reasonable to assume that positive norms and expectations, whether own or attributed, would be similar. That is, that for all observers, teachers should do what they are believed to be doing, all observers are in agreement on what teachers should and are believed to be doing, and all observers (correctly) attribute agreement to others. As we shall show presently, this is definitely not the case with the role of the teacher today. How, then, can we interpret disparities between own cognition and those attributed to others?

Implications for Teacher Role. The persistence of disparities between own cognitions held for teachers and those attributed to others for the teacher has implications for the teacher, for the respondent and for the sentient object persons to whom are attributed cognitions for the teacher. If such persistent disparities reflect actual differences in norms or expectations held for the teacher by various groups, then teachers will be faced with role conflict stemming from the resulting disparate behaviors of these groups - as when parents, school officials and even pupils (!) hold different norms for teacher behavior. But even if the attribution of different cognitions is not realistic, such phenomena have implications for the role of the teacher. For instance, we have some data to suggest that consensus exists among some respondents that whereas they, as individuals, do not disapprove of certain types of teacher activities (such as smoking), they believe that others do so. Provided that no opportunity is provided for respondents to rectify such false attributed cognitions, they may take action to restrict teacher behavior upon the assumption that others wish it.

Implications of own-attributed cognitive disparities for the respondent involve not only the concept of "cognitive dissonance" (see Festinger11/), but also suggest that for certain respondents, others are misinformed, prejudiced or intolerant.

Finally, differential treatment given to various sentient object groups by the respondent has implications both for that group and for teachers. For instance, if school officials are seen as being uniquely intolerant of teachers or as placing a great deal of pressure upon teachers for certain ends: (1) They are apt to be treated differently by respondents, and behaviors which they exhibit in the school system are apt to be interpreted in terms of the norms and expectations attributed against such attributions and may be misunderstood by respondents.

Implications for Role Theory. The most general implications of persistent own-attributed cognitive disparities stems from their very existence. That is, in many other role studies these two levels of phenomena have been taken to be equivalent. To show that they are not, and in what general ways each may be assumed to be a distortion of the other, is to make a significant contribution. Apart from this, however, disparities may be interpreted in at least three distinct ways: Role conflict, Pluralistic ignorance, and Response inhibition.

If we assume that the norms and expectations attributed to others are veridical, then there exist real distinctions between norms and expectations held for teachers by different groups. Such a state corresponds to one definition of role conflict. (For a fuller discussion of this term and its various uses, see Volume B of this series12/.) Role conflict results from various levels of experience of different groups or from differential need structure. Its implications for teacher role may be either direct or indirect. Direct pressures upon the teacher result from two groups of persons placing contradictory pressures upon teachers because they hold disparate cognitions. Indirect pressures result from a respondent behaving towards a teacher because of the (correct and disparate) cognitions he attributes to others. Obviously, where at all possible, persistent disparities between own and attributed cognitions should be tracked down to see whether or not they are, indeed, veridical.

If we assume that cognitions attributed to others are not veridical, then our finding may result from social factors stemming from the environment or from psychological factors stemming from the individual. In the former case, there exists a phenomenon known generally as pluralistic ignorance. Coined originally by Floyd Allport 13/ and later demonstrated in a rural community by Schanck 14/, pluralistic ignorance refers to a shared (but mistaken) consensus about the norms of others in the community. It generally results when an older system of morality is giving way to newer behavior patterns or where a great deal of heat is being generated by a few opinion leaders whose ideas are tolerated even though they do not necessarily represent the views of the majority (as in certain Southern communities over issues of desegration). To date, no studies have been made of pluralistic autism, (shared, but mistaken, consensus about the expectations of others - see Volume A of this series 9/. The implications of pluralistic ignorance or autism are that a campaign of public education is needed.

Finally, if disparities stem from the needs of the person himself - and are again in error - we shall refer to response inhibition. For example, respondents may wish to inhibit the expression of certain types of cognitions about teachers (such as expressions of hostility) but may project these onto others. It may be assumed that this type of phenomenon is more likely to occur for values which the respondent holds but of which he is ashamed.

Whether veridical or not, whether stemming from the needs of the respondent or from social factors in the community, it is clear that the existence of disparities between own and attributed cognitions for the teacher have considerable significance for the role of the teacher. It is the purpose of this volume to examine this problem in some detail.

The Three Studies

Three sets of data will be reported in this volume. The first stems from a Pilot Study of own and attributed cognitions held by 104 undergraduate students at an urban university. The second is from a Role Study where data were collected from 683 respondents representing seven different community positions in a major metropolitan area. The third stems once again from the responses of students, 244 respondents approximately evenly divided between education and non-education students, who were given the same questions as were the community members in the Role Study. Each of these studies will be described briefly here. For a more detailed description, the reader is referred to Volume 1 of this series[5]/.

The Pilot Study. The Pilot Study was conducted during the summer of 1959 and had as its major objectives: (a) The systematic exploration of own and attributed cognitions to find out whether enough disparities existed between these two classes of phenomena to warrant their joint investigation in later studies. (b) The testing out of certain types of role measuring instruments. In order to do these tasks, students from an urban university were asked to fill out questionnaires dealing with a variety of: (1) Characteristics of teachers. (2) Content

areas. (3) Types of cognitions. (4) Sentient object groups.

Three aspects of teachers were chosen for study: Behaviors, Traits, and Entrance into community settings. The behaviors and traits chosen for study were originally culled from the literature on teacher role and were subsequently refined by pre-testing with graduate students of educational psychology. Items chosen for community settings were selected from a list originally derived for another study (The Backgrounds Study, see Volume 1). Items chosen for inclusion in this study were selected so as to exhibit a wide variety of content areas and own norms - that is, we wanted to assure a wide coverage of both approved and disapproved teacher characteristics. Included within the final list were 35 traits, 40 behaviors, and 25 settings for teacher entrance. A full list of items used in the study (with certain items abbreviated) may be found in Tables 2.1 and 2.2. The complete forms used may be found in Appendix A of Volume 1.

A total of ten role element responses was obtained for each item. Respondents were asked to give their own norms and expectations, and then were asked to attribute norms and expectations to each of four sentient object groups: (1) Other people in general. (2) Other college students. (3) Parents of public school pupils. (4) Public school teachers. These sentient object groups were chosen upon the following bases: (1) We wished to include "the public" as an indication of what was assumed to be the public image of the teacher. (2) The group of College Students was a general reference position applying to all respondents but not including the object position (teachers). (3) Parents were an ubiquitous alter position presumed to be familiar with teachers but, again, unambiguously distinct from both teachers and students. (4) The group of Teachers allowed a comparison of own cognitions with cognitions attributed to the object position.

In answering all questions about teacher role cognitions, respondents were given a pre-coded, seven-point scale consisting of various strengths of cognition.

For norms, the points ranged from:

1 - (I feel) very strongly that teachers should not (do, be, show........) to:

7 - (I feel) very strongly that teachers should (do, be, show............).

For expectations, the points read:

1 - (I believe that) no teachers (are, do, show..........) to:

7 - (I believe that) all teachers (are, do, show.........).

Wording of questions was, of course, adjusted for attributed cognitions. Points in between the extremes were graded so that a complete ranking of responses from points 1 through 7 was available for all scales.

It should be noted that measures of cognitive strength are not equivalent to measures of cognitive position. The first deals with amount of subjective probability (for expectations) or approval (for norms). The second is concerned with various possible degrees of the behavior or other teacher characteristic involved. For instance, to know that a respondent expects "almost all" teachers to "smoke" does not really tell us too much about "how much smoking" the average teacher is expected to do. On the other hand, to discover that the modal teacher is expected to "smoke a little" does not tell us how many teachers the respondents expects to find at this point (or any other point) on a scale of various amounts of smoking. Both types of responses have been used in the past to measure role elements. Both have uses which are unique. We have chosen to use strength in the Pilot Study and position in the Role Study. For a more thorough discussion of the relationships between these two methods, the reader may turn to Volume A.

Forms for the Pilot Study were first pre-tested and were then administered to 104 students who were members of 11 undergraduate classes at an urban university. Data were collected during a summer term, but apart from season and urban location respondents may be assumed to represent a non-biased sample of the larger population of college students. A number of background questions were also asked of respondents, and an examination of these data may be found in Volume 1.

The Role Study. The Role Study was conducted during the winter and spring of 1960 and had as its major objectives the broad exploration of teacher role in a metropolitan center and the relating of role for the public school teacher to recruitment into the teaching profession. A number of distinct forms were used in the Role Study, of which only one, *Form 4*, may be analysed for differences between own and attributed cognitions. Form 4 consisted of a questionnaire which dealt with teacher behaviors in a variety of setting and social situation contexts, and dealt with norms and expectations held by respondents and attributed by respondents to three sentient object groups. (Data were also gathered in Form 4 from teachers reporting their own behavior, but these data are analysed elsewhere - see *Volume 2*[16]/.)

Fifty differing teacher behaviors-in-context were chosen for study in Form 4 of the Role Study. These items were prepared from the open-ended responses of community members who provided a list of physical settings, social situations, and likely teacher behaviors from which items could be chosen (see *Volume 1*). From among the thousands of items given by respondents, we chose 50 which exhibited a wide variety of content and context and which, we had evidence to believe, were likely to be fruitful for generating disparities between groups of respondents in their *own* norms and expectations. The fifty items were then broken into five sets and each set made into a sub-form of Form 4. A given respondent received only one of the five sub-forms (Forms 4-A, 4-B, 4-C, 4-D, or 4-E) to complete. This was necessitated by the demands of time and respondent fatigue and meant that only 1/5 of all respondents answered any given question. Careful sampling was used, however, to insure that random assignment of respondents to the various forms occurred.* Abbreviated item lists may be found in Tables 3.1 and 4.1, while the complete forms used may be found in Appendix C of *Volume 1*.

---

*Community respondents were under-sampled in Forms 4-D and 4-E due to a very snowy winter and clerical error. See Chapter III.

A total of eight role element responses was obtained for each item. Respondents were asked to give their own norms and expectations, and then to attribute norms and expectations to each of three sentient object groups: (1) People in General. (2) Teachers. (3) School Officials. In comparison with the sentient object groups used in the Pilot Study, it will be noted that Students and Parents have been dropped from the earlier list, while School Officials were added in the Role Study. Parents were eliminated because they appeared to be insignificantly different from People in General in the data from the Pilot Study (see Chapter II). Students were dropped, as thev no longer constituted a general reference position applying to community respondents for the Role Study. School Officials were added as a group which may be presumed to be a source of some considerable pressure upon teachers.

In answering all questions about teacher role cognitions, respondents were given a pre-coded, five-point scale consisting of various cognitive positions. For both norms and expectations this consisted of a series of rank ordered behavioral alternatives running from "Doing little or none" of the behavior involved to "Doing a great deal" of the same behavior. As discussed above, responses involving cognitive positions are not the same as responses involving strength of cognition, and this difference will be involved in our analysis.

Respondents in the Role Study may be divided into a Community group (Chapter III) and a Student group (Chapter IV). Involved within the Community group were samples of seven different positions of respondents: Parents, Pupils, Teachers, Principals, School Supervisors, Superintendents of Schools, and School Board Members. A total of 683 respondents were interviewed from 50 different schools in a major metropolitan area. Respondents were chosen so as to be representative of the community on a number of criteria including social class, size of school and school district, and urban-suburban-rural status. Interviews were conducted in central school locations, and respondents were asked to fill out a number of different forms - including Form 4 reported in this volume. The total interview session lasted approximately 2½ hours, and respondents were rewarded with coffee and donuts. With exception of those respondents who refused to be interviewed, even after several invitations, the samples for each position are felt to be representative of the total membership of those positions in the metropolitan area. On the other hand, it should be noted that the "community" sample does not represent a demographic sample of "the public". Whatever "public" is sampled here is a public oriented towards the school system. For a further discussion of sample characteristics see Volume 1.

The Student sample in the Role Study consisted of 244 undergraduate students approximately evenly divided between students in a school of education and students in other fields. Once again, the data were collected in an urban university (the same one), and a few respondents were actually interviewed in both Pilot and Role Studies. Student respondents in the Role Study answered the same forms and questions as did members of the Community; and once again, only 1/5 of the Student sample answered each of the five sub-forms of Form 4. The Student sample is, then, biased by having more students of education than would be expected by chance alone and because of the urban university status. Apart from these, the sample is reasonably representative of a college student population. The serious reader is, once again, referred to Volume 1 where a detailed break-down of the background characteristics of both Community and Student respondents in the Role Study are given.

Methods of Analysis

Several distinctions will be noted between the methods of analysis used in the Pilot Study and the Role Study. In the first place, the actual data of the two studies were based upon differing types of scaled information. As has previously been explained, scales used in the Pilot Study were measuring strength of cognition, while scales used in the Role Study dealt with modal position of cognition. As a less important difference, the Pilot Study used seven-point scales, while the Role Study used a five-point breakdown.

This does not account for the fact that findings from the Pilot Study are reported in terms of crude medians, while those of the Role Study are given in terms of average ranks; nor for the use of the median test to determine significance in the Pilot Study and the Mann-Whitney z_U in the Role Study. These differences are historical accidents. At the time the data from the Pilot Study were processed, the authors had access only to a hand calculator, and the prior reduction of data from the Pilot Study to 2 x 2 contingency tables was the most efficient method of data analysis. Later analyses have been made by computer using a program which calculates means and the Mann-Whitney z_U (see Volume C of this series[1]). The latter statistic is slightly more powerful than chi-square (used in the median test), as it takes into consideration all of the rank information available in a greater than two-point scale. As a result, we would assume that a recomputation of the Pilot Study results using the more powerful statistic would slightly increase the number of our significant findings. It is not felt that this gain would be worth the effort.

Finally, it should be noted that, in all studies, reported findings are restricted to differences between own and attributed cognitions. A number of other analyses are possible utilizing these data: (1) We might look at the differences among cognitions which are attributed to various sentient object groups. (2) We might analyse the relationships among norms and expectations. (3) We might break down the respondent group by age, sex, positional affiliation, or other characteristics.

For the first possibility, preliminary analyses were made of all three sets of data, but these did not show any new findings which were not implicit in the relationships between own and attributed cognitions. Our not reporting such additional findings also relieves us from reporting findings which are not statistically independent. In the second and third cases, data from these analyses are reported elsewhere. The relationships among positive and negative norms and expectations are reported in Volume 2 of this series 16/, while positional differences are taken up in Volume 3 18/. Other volumes not yet in draft will report additional breakdown of these data.

Limitations upon these Findings

Several factors operate to suggest limitations upon the conclusions reported here. First of all, there are the peculiar characteristics of the samples. The Pilot Study data were collected from undergraduate students during the summer term of an urban university. As a result, respondents were generally older and less "well-off" than the average college student. Student respondents in the Role Study were also from an urban setting, but in this latter case they were chosen so as to provide two balanced groups of education students and students whose major was not education. The Community sample in the Role Study is even harder to characterize. Although a careful sample of the entire metropolitan region for each of the seven respondent groups was made, Community respondents represent no "public" sample of the community except perhaps of those concerned with public school education. Left out, for instance, are citizens with no direct affiliation with the schools, and public school janitors, nurses and other school officials not interviewed. Finally, all three samples were taken within the confines of a single metropolitan area defined as five counties extending into two states.

The questions, too, are limited both in design and coverage. Although we have included two methods of measuring role cognitions (by strength of cognition and by cognitive position), the instruments utilized have depended upon a series of assumptions such as that role cognitions are conscious, that respondents are willing to give them honestly, and that cognitions held for different types of behavior or teacher characteristics may be tapped independently with a single, scaled question. Finally, these instruments are limited in content and coverage.

For these reasons, the authors would caution against generalization of findings in terms of specific areas of cognitive disparity or in terms of the actual size of mean differences. It is probable, for instance, that some of the findings reported represent conditions peculiar to the community in which the data were collected. Other samples, other techniques, other choices of items should generate a somewhat different pattern of significant differences.

It seems to us that what *is* important is the *fact* of cognitive disparity and the correlative facts that differences between own and attributed cognitions are widespread among our data and exhibit definite patterns to which one can point. These data are obviously more meaningful when integrated with other findings about teacher role reported in *Volume* 2,3, and 4 and others in this series 16,18,19/. Finally, it is hoped that others will replicate these investigations both with teacher role in other communities and with the roles of other positions, for it is only through additional information that these limitations can be overcome.

CHAPTER II

OWN AND ATTRIBUTED COGNITIONS FOR TEACHERS HELD BY COLLEGE STUDENTS - RESULTS FROM THE PILOT STUDY

Introduction

This Chapter presents results from the Pilot Study. Data are first presented in a series of tables, findings are identified and discussed briefly, and a table of summary statements is presented. The interpretation of these findings for role theory and the implications for the role of the public school teacher are left until Chapter V.

Tables of Results

The basic data on significant differences between own and attributed cognitions for the teacher are reported in Tables 2.1 and 2.2. Table 2.1 reports median normative ratings given to all items and is arranged in ascending order for own norms. (The item about which respondents felt most negative for teachers is listed first; the item about which they felt most strongly positive is listed last.) Figures reported are crude medians, and those attributed norms which were significantly different from own norms are indicated. Significance was computed by making a 2 x 2 contingency table out of the originally scaled responses and applying the median test (chi-square)*. In those cases where a significant difference existed between crude medians which were numerically equivalent, plus or minus signs are included to indicate the direction of the difference. For instance, respondents attributed a significantly more positive norm to College Students for the trait of "Drug Addiction" than they hold themselves, even though the crude medians are numerically equivalent.

Table 2.2 reports median expectational ratings given to all items and is similarly arranged in ascending order for own expectations. Again, crude median expectations are reported, and significant differences between own expectations

---

*A two-tailed test of significance was used throughout these analyses.

Table 2.1

Median Normative Ratings
(Items arranged in ascending median rating for own norm)

Items	Charac- teristics	Own Norm	People in General	College Students	Parents	Teachers
Drug Addiction	T[1]	1[2]	1	1+[3]*	1	1
Just Sits	B	1	1+*	1+*	1	1
Sarcastic	T	1	1	1+*	1	1+*
Ineffectiveness	T	1	1	1	1	1
Sexual Immorality	T	1	1-*	2*	1-*	1
Has Favorites	B	1	1	1+*	1	1+*
Alibi	B	1	1	1	1	1
Shows Peevishness	B	1	1	2*	1	1
Higher Standard	B	1	1	1+*	1	1
Gossips	B	1	1	2*	1	2*
Insobriety	T	1	1	2*	1-*	1
Jealousy	T	1	1	2	1	1
Depression	T	2	2	2+*	1*	2
Profanity	T	2	1*	2+*	1*	1
Autocratic	T	2	2	2	1*	2
Lets Minor Things Worry	B	2	2+*	2	2	2
Dreamy Manner	T	2	2	2	2	2
Boasts about Education	B	2	1	2	2	1
Deficient Auditory Sense	T	2	2	2	1*	2
Sissiness	T	2	2	2	2	2
Old Maidishness	T	2	2	2	2	2
Associates with Questionable Characters	B	2	1*	3	1*	2-*
Impersonal Attitude	T	2	3	3	1*	2
Liquor or Drug Addiction Clinic	S	2	1*	2	1*	1*
Taverns	S	2	1*	3	1*	2-*
Objects Attending Assembly Program	B	2	2	3	2	2-*
Straight-Lipped Expression	T	2	3	3	3	2
Talks Shop	B	3	2	3	3	3
Clears Voice	B	3	3	3	3	3

---

[1] Items marked "T" are Traits, "B" are Behaviors, and "S" are Settings.

[2] All numbers refer to crude medians on the following scale:

1 - Very strongly (Teachers should)
2 - Moderately
3 - Not strong at all
4 - Don't care
5 - Not strong at all
6 - Moderately
7 - Very strongly (Teachers should not)

[3] (*) items are significantly different (<.05) from the own norm ratings in the direction indicated. (+) and (-) are used to indicate differences which are not indicated by the crude median alone.

Table 2.1 (Continued)

Median Normative Ratings

Items	Characteristics	Own Norm	People in General	College Students	Parents	Teachers
Stops Pupils	B	3	3	3	3	3
Uses Shop	B	3	2*	3	2*	2*
Stops at 3:00 p.m.	B	3	2	4	2*	3
Billard Parlor	S	3	1*	3	1*	2*
Minister-like Appearance	T	3	3	3	4	3
Speaks Rapidly	B	3	4	4	3	4
Prisons	S	4	1*	3	1*	2*
Dog Race Tracks	S	4	2*	4	1*	3*
Beer Supply Company	S	4	1*	4	1*	2*
Horse Race Track	S	4	2*	4	1*	3*
Wrinkles	T	4	4-*	4	4-*	4
Police Stations	S	4	2*	4	1*	3*
State Patrol Office	S	4	3*	4	2*	3*
County Jails	S	4	1*	3	1*	2*
Old Age	T	4	3*	3*	3*	4
Catholic Church	S	4	4	4	4	4
Makes Political Speeches	B	4	2*	4	2*	3*
Slums	S	4	2*	4	2*	3*
Psychiatric Receiving Center	S	4	3*	4	3*	4-*
Not Active Politically	B	4	4	4	4	4
Boy's or Girl's Private School	S	4	4-*	4	4	4
Member of Co-op	B	4	5*	4	4	4
Settlement House	S	4	4	4	4	4
Driving School	S	4	4	4	4	4
Owns Car	B	4	4	4	4	4
Bible School	S	4	4	4	4+*	4
Teaches After Marriage	B	4	4	4	4	4-*
Uses Lipstick	B	4	4	4	4	4
Stays Home with Cold	B	4	4	4	4	4
Children's Home	S	4	4+*	4	4	4
Superintendent's Office	S	4	5	4	5	4.5
Junior College	S	4	5	5	5*	5
Writes up Experiments	B	4	4	5	4	5
Denies Privileges	B	4	5	4	5*	5*
Rigid Course Training	B	4	5	5	5	5
Meticulousness	T	5	5	4*	5	5
Thrift	T	5	5	4	6*	6
Learns Teaching Methods from Supervisor	B	5	4*	5	5	5
Religiousness	T	5	5	4*	6*	5
Public Museums	S	5	6*	5	6*	6
Refrains from Political Activity	B	5	6	5	6*	6*
Uses Simple Illustrations	B	5	5+*	5	5	5
Seriousness	T	6	6	5	6	6
Popularity	T	6	6	6	6	6

Table 2.1 (Continued)
Median Normative Ratings

Items	Charac-tèristics	Own Norm	People in General	College Students	Parents	Teachers
Entertaining Ways	T	6	5*	5	5*	5*
Animation	T	6	5	6	6	6
Public Art Galleries	S	6	6	6	6	6
Bookstores	S	6	6+*	5	6	6
Decisiveness	T	6	6	6	6	6
Follows Definite Procedure	B	6	6-*	6	6	6
Normality	T	6	7	6	7	6
Educational Work Shop	S	6	6+*	6	6+*	6+*
Good Voice	T	6	6-*	6	6	6
Teachers' College	S	6	7*	6	7*	6+*
Conventional Table Manners	B	6	6	6	7	6
Pleasant Expression	B	6	6	6	6	6
Friendliness	T	6	6	6-*	6	6
Progressiveness	T	6	6	7	6	6
Signs for Library Books	B	6	5	5	6	6
Admits Inability	B	6	6-*	6-*	6	6
Checks Work Plans	B	7	6*	6	6	6
Looks for New Material	B	7	6*	6	6*	7
Follows up the Recitation	B	7	6*	6	6*	7
Broad Interest	T	7	6*	7	6*	6*
Courtesy	T	7	7	6*	7	7
Emotional Stability	T	7	7	7-*	7	7
Impartiality	T	7	7	7	7-*	7
Shows Patience	B	7	7	7-*	7	7-*
Well-prepared Lessons	B	7	7-*	7	7-*	7-*
Sincerity	T	7	7-*	6*	7-*	7-*
Recognizes Individual Differences	B	7	7-*	7-*	7-*	7-*

and attributed expectations are indicated with an asterisk and a ≠ or - sign where needed.

Tables 2.1 and 2.2 exhibit, between them, 220 significant differences. These are far too many findings to be comprehended at a single reading. Tables 2.3 through 2.12 have been prepared in summary of Tables 2.1 and 2.2. Table 2.3 displays the signed significant differences between attributed and own norms in relation to median own norm rating and sentient object group. For instance, in looking at this table it will be seen that there were 9 positive significant differences between own norms and norms attributed to College Students at a median own norm rating of "1" whereas there were no negative significant differences for this same combination. (Signs in Tables 2.3 through 3.10 are merely a summary of signs in Tables 2.1 and 2.2. A "≠" sign indicates that the attributed cognition was significantly greater in scale value than the corresponding own cognition; a "-" sign indicates the reverse.) Particular attention should be paid in Table 2.3 to the column headed "Number of Items Available." There were only a certain number of items which fell at each of the seven median own norm ratings, and interpretations of number of positive and negative differences to be found must take this total number of available items into consideration.

Tables 2.4 through 2.10 are set up in the same format as Table 2.3. Table 2.4 displays the significant differences between own norms and attributed norms for teacher entrance into settings. Table 2.5 deals with teacher behaviors, while Table 2.6 displays differences for teacher traits. Tables 2.4 through 2.6 should be considered a break-down of the results in Table 2.3. Table 2.7 consists of a display of significant signed differences between own expectations and attributed expectations in relation to median own expectation and sentient object group. It is laid out exactly as is Table 2.3. Tables 2.8 through 2.10 consist of a break-down of the significant signed differences between own expectations and attributed expectations for settings, behaviors and traits.

Table 2.2

Median Expectation Ratings
(Items arranged in ascending median rating for own expectation)

Items	Characteristics	Own Self	People in General	College Students	Parents	Teachers
Drug Addiction	T[1]	2[2]	1*[3]	2	1*	2
Liquor or Drug Addiction Clinic	S	2	1*	2	1*	2
Prisons	S	2	2-*	2	2-*	2-*
County Jail	S	2	2-*	2	2-*	2
Beer Supply Company	S	2	2-*	2	2-*	2
Insobriety	T	2	2-*	2	2-*	2
Taverns	S	2	2-*	2	2-*	2
Associates with Questionable Characters	B	2	2	2	2-*	2
Billard Parlor	S	2	2-*	2	2-*	2
Makes Political Speeches	B	2	2	2	2	2
Sexual Immorality	T	2	2-*	2	2-*	2-*
Deficient Auditory Sense	T	2	2	2	2-*	2
State Patrol Office	S	2	2	2	2	2
Psychiatric Receiving Center	S	2	2	2	2	2
Horse Race Tracks	S	2	2-*	2	2-*	2
Police Station	S	2	2-*	2	2-*	2-*
Dog Race Tracks	S	2	2-*	2	2-*	2-*
Just Sits in Classroom	B	2	3	3	2	2
Sissiness	T	3	2	3	2	2
Dreamy Manner	T	3	2	2	2	2*
Presents Alibi (instead of work)	B	3	3-*	3	2*	2
Sarcastic and Abusive Manner	T	3	2	3	2*	2*
Depression	T	3	2*	3	2*	2*
Minister-like Appearance	T	3	3+*	3	3	2
Slums	S	3	2*	2	2*	2*
Writes up Experiments	B	3	3	3	3	3
Profanity	T	3	2*	3	2*	2*
Stays Home First Sign of Cold	B	3	3	3	3+*	3
Shows Peevishness	B	3	3	3	2*	3-*

---

[1] Items marked "T" are Traits, "B" are Behaviors, and "S" are settings.

[2] All numbers refer to crude medians on the following scale:

1 - None
2 - Very few
3 - A minority
4 - About half
5 - A majority
6 - Almost all
7 - All

[3] (*) items are significantly different (<.05) from the own norm ratings in the direction indicated. (+* and (-) are used to indicate differences which are not indicated by the crude median alone.

Table 2.2 (Continued)

Median Expectation Ratings

Items	Characteristics	Own Self	People in General	College Students	Parents	Teachers
Sets Higher Standards	B	3	3	3	3	2
Old Maidishness	T	3	3	3	3	3
Uses Shop	B	3	3	3	3	3
Straight-lipped Expression	T	3	3+*	3	3	3
Clears Voice	B	3	3	3	3	2*
Boasts about Education	B	3	3+*	3	3	3
Old Age	T	3	3.5*	3	3	3
Jealousy	T	3	3-*	3	2*	3
Impersonal Attitude	T	3	4*	3	3	3
Lets Minor Things Worry Him	B	3	3	3	3	3
Objects to Taking Part in Assembly Program	B	3	3	3	3+*	3
Settlement House	S	3	3	2	3	3
Boy's or Girl's Private School	S	3	3	3	3	3
Ineffectiveness	T	3	3-*	3	2*	2*
Childrens' Home	S	3	4	3	3+*	3
Member Co-op	B	3	3	3	3	3
Learns Teaching Methods from Supervisor	B	3	4*	4	4*	4*
Autocratic Attitude	T	3	3	3	3-*	3-*
Driving School	S	3	3	3	3	3
Talks Shop out of School	B	3	4	3	3	3
Gossips	B	3	3	3	3	3
Wrinkles	T	4	4	4	4	4
Catholic Churches	S	4	4	4	3	3
Rigid Course of Training	B	4	4	4	3	4
Speaks Rapidly	B	4	4	4	4	4+*
Entertaining Ways	T	4	4	4	4	4
Bible School	S	4	4	4	4	4
Stops at 3:00 p.m.	B	4	4	3	3*	3*
Stops Pupils to Correct	B	4	4	4	3	3
Has Favorites	B	4	4	4	3	3*
Junior College	S	4	4	4	4	4
Meticulousness	T	4	5	4	5	4
Not Active Politically	B	4	4	4	4	4+*
Uses Simple Illustrations	B	4	4	4	4	5
Animation	T	4	5	4	5*	5*
Admits Inability	B	4	4.5	4	5	5
Popularity	T	4	5	4	5	5*
Teaches after Marriage	B	4	4	5	4	4
Wears Pleasant Expression	B	4	5	5	5	4-*
Public Museums	S	4	5	5	5	5
Superintendent of Schools' Office	S	4	4	4	5	5
Checks Work Plans	B	4	4	5	5	5
Public Art Galleries	S	4.5	5	5	5	5

Table 2.2 (Continued)

Median Expectation Ratings

Items	Charac-teristics	Own Self	People in General	College Students	Parents	Teachers
Religiousness	T	5	5	4	5	5
Thrift	T	5	5	5	5	5
Good Voice	T	5	5	5	5	5
Seriousness	T	5	5	5	5/*	5/*
Denies Special Privileges	B	5	5	5	5	5
Shows much Patience	B	5	5	5	5	5
Looks for New Materials	B	5	5	5	5/*	5/*
Follows up Recitation	B	5	5	5	5	5/*
Impartiality	T	5	5	5	5	5/*
Lessons Well-prepared	B	5	5	5	5	6*
Broad Interest	T	5	5	5	5	5/*
Progressiveness	T	5	5	5	5	5
Decisiveness	T	5	5	5	5	6
Friendliness	T	5	5	5	5	6
Follows Definite Procedure	B	5	5	5	5	6*
Bookstore	S	5	5	5	5	5
Emotional Stability	T	5	6*	5	6	6*
Recognizes Individual Differences	B	5	5	5	5	5
Sincerity	T	5	6	5	6	6
Educational Workshop	S	5	6	6	6	6
Courtesy	T	5	6	5	6	6
Uses Lipstick	B	6	5	6	5	5
Owns Car	B	6	6	5	5	5
Normality	T	6	6	5	6	6
Refrains from Political Activity on Duty	B	6	6	5	5	6
Conventional Table Manners	B	6	6	6	6	6
Signs for Library Books	B	6	6	5	5.5	6
Teachers College	S	6	6	5.5	5	6

Tables 2.11 and 2.12 consist of a general summary of (unsigned) significant differences in relation to teacher characteristic (setting entrance, behavior, trait) and sentient object group. Its organization is self-explanatory. Table 2.13 is a scattergram showing the relationships between median own norm and median own expectation ratings for each of the 100 items involved in the study.

Findings

In reporting findings, materials may be drawn from several tabular sources. As a result, findings will be presented in outline form with Tabular References.

General Findings. (1) There are wide-spread and significant differences between own cognitions and cognitions attributed to others for the teacher (Tables 2.1 and 2.2). These differences exist between own cognitions and the cognitions attributed to each of the sentient object groups and may be found at all levels of median own cognition ratings. The differences are sufficiently prevalent to suggest that any study cast at either the "own" or "attributed" level and which attemped to generalize to the other level was probably significantly in error. It is also implied that a thorough study of the total role of the teacher necessitates a study of both own and attributed cognitions.

(2) Nevertheless, there exist significant differences in the patterns of cognitions attributed to the various sentient object groups (Tables 2.1 and 2.2). These differences are sufficiently strong as to suggest that one would not be justified in assuming that attributions to any one group would also hold for any other.

(3) Despite the large number of significant differences, the median ratings given to all four sentient object groups are remarkably similar to those given to own cognitions (Tables 2.1 and 2.2). There is little evidence of severe role conflict in the public school teacher role, if we adopt as a defining

Table 2.3

Number of Significant Differences Between Attributed and Own Norms (for all teacher characteristics) by Sign, Sentient Object Group, and Median Own Norm

Median Own Norms	Sentient Object Group People in General +	-	College Students +	-	Parents +	-	Teachers +	-	Totals +	-	Total	Number of Items Available	Average Number of Sig. Diff.
1	1	1	9			2	3		13	3	16	12	1.33
2	1	4	2			8		4	3	16	19	15	1.27
3		2				3		2	0	7	7	8	.88
4	2	13		1	3	12	1	11	6	37	43	29	1.48
5	2	1		2	4		1		7	3	10	7	1.43
6	3	4		2	2	1	2	1	7	8	15	18	.83
7		7		5		7		5	0	24	24	11	2.18
Total	9	32	11	10	9	33	7	23	36	98	134	100	1.34

Table 2.4

Number of Significant Differences Between Attributed and Own Norms for Teacher Entrance Into Settings by Sign, Sentient Object Group, and Median Own Norm

Median Own Norms	Sentient Object Group People in General +	-	College Students +	-	Parents +	-	Teachers +	-	Totals +	-	Total	Number of Items Available
1									0	0	0	0
2		2				2		2		6	6	2
3		1				1		1		3	3	1
4	1	10			2	9		9	3	28	31	17
5	1				1				2	0	2	1
6	3				2		2		7	0	7	4
7									0	0	0	0
Total	5	13	0	0	5	12	2	12	12	37	49	25

criterion of role conflict the existence of gross own-attributed disparities. As far as college students are concerned, differences between their own cognitions and those which they attribute to others for teachers do not tend to be grossly different.

(4) Finally, there are strong tendencies in both normative and expectational data for own-attributed differences to be negative. That is, respondents tend to see others as being less approving and as expecting less behavior of teachers than themselves. This suggests that as far as college students are concerned, members of other sentient object groups are less tolerant of teacher characteristics (whatever they may be) and are less likely to expect varieties in various teacher behaviors.

Expectations and Norms. (5) Differences in Table 2.7 suggest that there is a relationship between median own expectation and attributed expectations given to others. Where respondents feel that a particular teacher characteristic is unlikely, they attribute to others even less expectation for that characteristic. In contrast, where they feel that a behavior or trait is likely, others see that aspect as extremely likely. In interpreting this finding, it should be noted that there is a positive correlation between median own norm and median own expectation (see Table 2.13). Thus, Table 2.7 may be interpreted to show that respondents attribute expectations of teacher conformity to norms to others. Whether right or wrong, such a finding speaks loudly about the role of the teacher. If borne out by other evidence, teachers are seen as having a "public reputation" of conformity which is, according to college students, incorrect.

(6) If conformity is indicated in the expectations of Table 3.7, the norms of Table 3.3 show an opposite trend. At extreme own norms (points 1 and 7), respondents attribute less extreme norms to others. Thus, for characteristics

Table 2.5

Number of Significant Differences Between Attributed and Own Norms for Teacher Behaviors by Sign, Sentient Object Group, and Median Own Norm

		Sentient Object Group											
		People in General		College Students		Parents		Teachers		Totals		Total	Number of Items Available
		+	-	+	-	+	-	+	-	+	-		
Median Own Norms	1	1		5				2		8	0	8	6
	2	1	1				1		2	1	4	5	4
	3		1				2		1	0	4	4	6
	4	1	1			1	1	1	2	3	4	7	10
	5	1	1			1		1		3	1	4	3
	6		2		1					0	3	3	5
	7		5		2		4		3	0	14	14	6
	Total	4	11	5	3	2	8	4	8	15	30	45	40

Table 2.6

Number of Significant Differences Between Attributed and Own Norms for Teacher Traits by Sign, Sentient Object Group, and Median Own Norm

		Sentient Object Group											
		People in General		College Students		Parents		Teachers		Totals		Total	Number of Items Available
		+	-	+	-	+	-	+	-	+	-		
Median Own Norms	1		1	4			2	1		5	3	8	6
	2		1	2			5			2	6	8	9
	3									0	0	0	1
	4		2		1		2			0	5	5	2
	5				2	2				2	2	4	3
	6		2		1		1		1	0	5	5	9
	7		2		3		3		2	0	10	10	5
	Total	0	8	6	7	2	13	1	3	9	31	40	35

of which respondents highly approve, others are seen as less approving, and vice-versa. This is particularly noteworthy at a median own norm of "7" where 24 out of 24 significant differences are all negative. It is possible, of course, that this finding is artifactive due to the wedging of possible variation in attributed scores against the "end-point" of the scale. But it is also possible that there exists a group of teacher characteristics which college student respondents feel that they are unique in strongly approving. If this is the case, it is also implied that more of these unique items are things which teachers should do or be rather than things which teachers should not exhibit. At any rate, college students see themselves as uniquely different from all others (including other college students) in the holding of extreme norms for teachers.

(7) In general there are more significant differences between own and attributed norms than there are between own and attributed expectations - 134 for the former as compared with 86 for the latter (Tables 2.3 and 2.7). Respondents generally feel that others are more likely to differ from themselves in values held about teachers than in their judgments of what teachers are more likely to do. (It is possible, but not likely, that this finding is an artifact.) It will be observed that items chosen for study included normative extremes, while the range of median own expectations was much narrower. It is possible that more significant differences would have been reported had we included items which exhibited expectational extremes. But items fitting this description were extremely difficult to find, and it would seem that even at the middle scale values there tend to be more significant differences in Table 2.3 than in 2.7.

(8) Although no consistent relationship appears between median own norm and number of significant differences reported (Table 2.3), there is a clear relationship between median own expectation and number of differences (Table 2.7).

Table 2.7

Number of Significant Differences Between Attributed and Own Expectations (for all teacher characteristics) by Sign, Sentient Object Group, and Median Own Expectation

Median Own Expectation	Sentient Object Group People in General +	People in General -	College Students +	College Students -	Parents +	Parents -	Teachers +	Teachers -	Totals +	Totals -	Total	Number of Items Available	Average Number of Sig. Diff.
1									0	0	0	0	——
2		12				14		4	0	30	30	18	1.67
3	6	6			4	9	1	10	11	25	36	32	1.12
4					1	1	4	3	5	4	9	22	.41
5	1				2		8		11	0	11	21	.52
6									0	0	0	7	.00
7									0	0	0	0	——
Total	7	18	0	0	7	24	13	17	27	59	86	100	.86

Table 2.8

Number of Significant Differences Between Attributed and Own Expectations for Teacher Entrance into Settings by Sign, Sentient Object Group, and Median Own Expectation

Median Own Expectation	Sentient Object Group People in General +	People in General -	College Students +	College Students -	Parents +	Parents -	Teachers +	Teachers -	Totals +	Totals -	Total	Number of Items Available
1									0	0	0	0
2		9				9		3	0	21	21	11
3		1			1	1		1	1	3	4	5
4									0	0	0	6
5									0	0	0	2
6									0	0	0	1
7									0	0	0	0
Totals	0	10	0	0	1	10	0	4	1	24	25	25

Dividing the number of significant differences between own and attributed expectations by the available number of items rated at each median point, we discover that the majority of differences occur for teacher characteristics which are felt to be unlikely. Respondents, in fact, see no differences between their own expectations and those of others at the highest reported median expectation, "6." According to college student respondents, then, there is a negative correlation between likelihood of teachers showing a given characteristic and amount of disagreement among groups as to their estimate of likelihood. Respondents attribute to others the greatest amount of ignorance for teacher behaviors which are unlikely to occur anyway (and which are also disapproved - see Table 2.13).

Findings for Sentient Object Groups. (9) Norms attributed to College Students are consistently more "conservative" than own norms (Table 2.3). In all cases for which median own norms are high, the College Student differences are negative, and vice-versa. Thus, respondents tend to attribute more conservative norms to the reference group of which they are members than they admit to holding themselves. It is possible that respondents may feel that their own norms are idiosyncratic as a result of peculiarities of the college student position and circumstance (resulting in pluralistic ignorance), or that respondents are projecting their own values upon other students (response inhibition). We cannot adequately differentiate between these alternative explanations within the data, but it should be noted: (a) That respondents are clearly wrong in the norms they attribute to other college students. (b) That the greatest disparities in norms attributed are made at the extremes of approval and disapproval. At any rate, the norms attributed to College Students are radically different from those attributed to all other reference groups (of which respondents are not members).

Table 2.9

Number of Significant Differences Between Attributed and Own Expectations for Teacher Behaviors by Sign, Sentient Object Group and Median Own Expectation

	Sentient Object Group											
	People in General		College Students		Parents		Teachers		Totals			Number of Items Available
	+	-	+	-	+	-	+	-	+	-	Total	
Median Own Expectation 1									0	0	0	0
2						1			0	1	1	3
3	2	1			3	2	1	2	6	5	11	14
4						1	2	3	3	3	6	11
5					1		4		5	0	5	7
6									0	0	0	5
7									0	0	0	0
Total	2	1	0	0	4	4	7	5	14	9	23	40

Table 2.10

Number of Significant Differences Between Attributed and Own Expectations for Teacher Traits by Sign, Sentient Object Group, and Median Own Expectation

	Sentient Object Group											
	People in General		College Students		Parents		Teachers		Totals			Number of Items Available
	+	-	+	-	+	-	+	-	+	-	Total	
Median Own Expectation 1									0	0	0	0
2		3				4		1	0	8	8	4
3	4	4				6		7	4	17	21	13
4					1		2		1	2	3	5
5	1				1		4		6	0	6	12
6									0	0	0	1
7									0	0	0	0
Total	5	7	0	0	2	10	6	8	11	27	38	35

(10) Of similar interest is the fact that no significant differences appear between own and attributed expectations for College Students as a sentient object group (Table 2.7). If respondents feel that their own values are idiosyncratic, they do not evidence any such judgments about their expectations. Respondents may feel that the university milieu trains in the processes of reality orientation, while values remain the province of the individual or are generated uniquely for the individual.

(11) There is considerable similarity in the expectations and norms attributed to Parents and People in General (Tables 2.1 and 2.2). Not only are the patterns of differences similar, but the median item ratings tend to be the same for these two groups. Both groups also share a similar preponderance of negative normative and expectational differences (Tables 2.3 and 2.7). This casts considerable doubt as to whether there is cognitive differentiation of these two sentient object groups in the minds of college student respondents, at least for the purposes of teacher role analysis.

(12) In general, the norms and expectations attributed to Teachers lie between those attributed to College Students and those attributed to Parents and People in General. Teachers are not seen as strikingly reality-oriented in expectations held for their own profession (whereas College Students are).

Findings for Teacher Characteristics. (13) Table 2.11 reveals that with the exception of College Students as a sentient object group, a greater proportion of differences between own and attributed norms are to be found for teacher entrance into settings than for teacher traits or behaviors. It may also be noted (in Table 2.4) that these significant normative differences distribute themselves strictly in accordance with median own norms held. Respondents not only do not feel strongly themselves about teacher entrance into settings (there are no cases at points "1" or "7"), but in every case, where a significant difference occurs, they attribute a stronger approval or disapproval to

Table 2.11

Number of Significant Differences Between Own and Attributed Norms by Sentient Object Group and Characteristic

	Sentient Object Groups								
	People in General		College Students		Parents		Teachers		Number of Items Available
Characteristics	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	
Traits	8	22.9*	13	37.1	15	42.9	4	11.4	35
Behaviors	15	37.5	8	20.0	10	25.0	12	30.0	40
Settings	18	72.0	0	0.0	17	68.0	14	56.0	25
Total	41		21		42		30		100

*Percent of total available items for each characteristic.

Table 2.12

Number of Significant Differences Between Own and Attributed Expectations by Sentient Object Group and Characteristic

	Sentient Object Groups								
	People in General		College Students		Parents		Teachers		Number of Items Available
Characteristics	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	
Traits	12	34.3*	0	0.0	12	34.3	14	40.0	35
Behaviors	3	7.5	0	0.0	8	20.0	12	30.0	40
Settings	10	40.0	0	0.0	11	44.0	4	16.0	25
Total	25		0		31		30		100

*Percentage of total available items for each characteristic.

others for teacher entrance. The loud exception to this generalization is the College Student group to whom they (correctly) attribute disinterest in teacher appearance in settings.

(14) In contrast, there are considerably fewer expectational differences for setting entrance (Table 2.12), Teachers are seen as being more reality oriented regarding setting entrance than are others (Table 2.12), and those differences which do appear are all concerned with teacher entrance into unlikely (and disapproved) settings (Table 2.8). We also note in Table 2.8 that out of 25 significant differences between own and attributed expectations for teacher entrance into settings, 24 of them suggest that others believe teachers to be less likely to enter the already unlikely (and disapproved) settings. Once again, College Students are seen to be insignificantly different from respondents with regard to expectations for teacher entrance of settings.

(15) There are no particular systematic differences between teacher behaviors and teacher traits as producers of own-attributed disparities.

Summary

Findings from the Pilot Study may be summarized under several general statements. (Implications of these findings for the role of the teacher and the structure of role theory are delayed until Chapter V.)

2.1 - Extensive and significant differences were discovered between own and attributed cognitions for all sentient object groups and item types (Finding 1).

2.2 - Despite the large numbers of significant differences, the median ratings for all sentient object groups were sufficiently similar to those given in own cognitions as to give little evidence of severe role conflict in the public school teacher role (Finding 3).

2.3 - More differences existed between own and attributed norms than between own and attributed expectations (Finding 7).

Table 2.13

Relationship between Median Own Norm and Median Own Expectation Ratings

		Median Own Expectation							
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Total
Median Own Norm	1		4	7	1				12
	2		4	11					15
	3		1	4	3				8
	4		9	9	8	1	2		29
	5			1	3	2	1		7
	6				6	8	4		18
	7				1	10			11
	Total	0	18	32	22	21	7	0	100

2.4 - College Students saw others as being less tolerant of teacher characteristics (whatever they might be) and less likely to expect varieties in teacher characteristics (Finding 4).

2.5 - Respondents attributed a public expectation to others of teacher conformity to norms while they themselves expected less conformity (Finding 5).

2.6 - At normative extremes only, College Students maintained a group of teacher characteristics which they approved (or disapproved) more strongly than they say others did (Finding 6).

2.7 - Respondents attributed to others a greater ignorance of actual teacher characteristics for those unlikely to occur (or are disapproved); there were few to no disparities where teacher characteristics were seen as highly likely (Finding 8).

2.8 - Cognitions attributed to various sentient object groups are considerably different from one another (Finding 2).

2.9 - Despite this general tendency, few differences appeared between the sentient object groups of "Parents" and "People in General" (Finding 11).

2.10 - Norms attributed to college Students were consistently more conservative than norms which college students themselves held. These obviously mistaken attributed norms were also more in evidence for normative extremes (Finding 9).

2.11 - There were no significant differences between respondents own expectations and those they attributed to other College Students. In contrast, teachers were not seen as strikingly reality-oriented about their own profession (Findings 10, 12).

2.12 - College student respondents did not themselves feel strongly about teacher entrance into community settings, but they attributed strong feelings to others (except College Students) about such events (Finding 13).

2.13 - There were fewer expectational differences for teacher entrance into settings than for teacher traits or behaviors, but those differences which occurred were all concerned with the unreasonable expectations of others who did not believe that teachers enter unlikely (and disapproved) settings, whereas college students knew better (Finding 14).

CHAPTER III

OWN AND ATTRIBUTED COGNITIONS FOR TEACHERS HELD BY THE COMMUNITY

Introduction

This Chapter presents results from the Community sample in the Role Study. As in Chapter II, data are first presented in a series of tables, findings are identified and discussed briefly, and a table of summary statements is presented. The interpretation of these findings for role theory and applications for the role of the public school teacher are, once more, left until Chapter V.

Tables of Results

The basic data from which this Chapter is derived are given in Table 3.1. It will be observed that Table 3.1 lists means for own and attributed cognitions for expectations, positive norms, and negative norms. These data were drawn from the group of community respondents as a whole. That is, all means were computed by summing together the responses from arbitrary samples of seven community positions (pupils, parents, teachers, school board members, principals, school superintendents, and school supervisors) and dividing by the total number of community respondents. It should be noted that Table 3.1 is broken into two sections by a horizontal line. The first thirty items (which came from sub-forms 4-A, 4-B, and 4-C) were answered by a substantial group of respondents. The last ten items in Table 3.1 (from sub-form 4-D) were answered by only a few respondents and yielded few significant differences between own and attributed cognitions. Items from sub-form 4-E were answered by too few respondents to be worth tabulating in this Chapter. (Lacks of respondents in sub-forms 4-D and 4-E were due to a combination of extremely snowy weather during the months of data collection and clerical error.

Table 3.1

Community Means for Own and Attributed Cognitions for Public School Teacher Behaviors

Teacher Behavior Items	N	Expectations				Positive Norms				Negative Norms			
		Own	PG	T	SO	Own	PG	T	SO	Own	PG	T	SO
(1) Watching pupils study	186	3.45	3.92	3.77	4.16	3.58	3.96	3.70	4.05	1.93	1.37	1.58	1.29
(2) Supervising class test	184	3.71	3.94	3.75	4.04	3.84	3.96	3.72	3.95	1.73	1.55	1.87	1.55
(3) Singing Along	186	3.74	3.65	3.46	3.57	3.70	3.78	3.41	3.62	1.84	1.65	2.08	1.64
(4) Ignoring misbehavior	186	1.84	1.83	1.91	1.78	1.86	1.90	1.86	1.77	4.30	4.17	4.27	4.43
(5) Keeping library quiet	183	4.31	4.40	4.39	4.46	4.28	4.37	4.29	4.51	1.47	1.37	1.35	1.27
(6) Speaking out at PTA	186	2.45	2.78	2.47	2.91	2.97	2.87	2.79	2.91	2.95	3.19	3.40	3.00
(7) Policing the halls	182	3.40	3.68	3.43	3.82	3.45	3.76	3.56	3.98	2.12	1.64	1.83	1.40
(8) Disciplining at basketball	185	2.82	3.16	2.82	3.23	3.04	3.28	3.20	3.39	2.51	2.18	2.21	2.06
(9) Visiting T's on playground	186	2.47	2.36	2.78	2.09	2.45	2.17	2.83	2.21	3.93	4.25	3.04	4.06
(10) Cooperating with Teach.	186	4.63	4.52	4.48	4.71	4.65	4.58	4.57	4.75	1.13	1.11	1.11	1.11

Note: In all Tables of Chapter III, the following conventions will be adopted: Own = Cognitions held by respondents themselves. PG = Cognitions attributed by respondents to People in General. T = Cognitions attributed to Teachers. SO = Cognitions attributed to School Officials. N = Number of respondents. Item numbers given are in reference to Appendix D , Volume I (where complete statements of all items may be found). All mean values and mean difference figures refer to five-point scales. Points for the expectational scale read: 1-- (Teachers do) A great deal of (the behavior involved)
2 - ... A lot of ...
3 - ... A moderate amount of ...
4 - ... A slight amount of ...
5 - ... Little or no ...

Points for the normative questions were identical except that respondents were asked for values. Separate ratings were given for most and least approved points.

Table 3.1 (Contd)

Teacher Behavior Items	N	Expectations				Positive Norms				Negative Norms			
		Own	PO	T	SO	Own	PO	T	SO	Own	PO	T	SO
(11) Visiting T's during study	189	1.77	2.02	2.23	1.64	1.79	1.85	2.38	1.76	4.38	4.40	3.63	4.41
(12) Watching for cheaters	188	3.47	3.99	3.59	4.02	3.51	3.94	3.57	3.94	2.58	1.88	2.17	1.68
(13) Having pupils sing solos	189	2.05	2.50	2.26	2.42	2.24	2.68	2.42	2.58	3.91	3.34	3.73	3.41
(14) Telling pupils stop talking	189	3.41	3.92	3.55	3.62	3.28	3.69	3.46	3.57	2.77	2.04	3.68	2.47
(15) Studying in library	185	3.70	3.31	3.14	3.36	3.22	3.48	3.29	3.52	2.68	2.39	2.95	2.33
(16) Attending PTA meetings	187	4.06	4.34	3.75	4.46	3.95	4.36	3.74	4.44	1.49	1.30	2.16	1.22
(17) Allowing exploration in lab.	180	2.99	3.12	2.88	2.98	3.31	3.18	2.96	3.13	2.24	2.49	2.24	2.35
(18) Kibitzing during basketball game	179	2.12	2.28	2.16	2.04	2.10	2.12	2.24	2.12	3.92	3.77	3.92	3.92
(19) Supervising on playground	188	3.88	4.06	3.72	4.30	3.89	4.32	3.72	4.34	1.82	1.43	1.99	1.25
(20) Cooperating with principal	187	4.62	4.66	4.52	4.80	4.65	4.68	4.46	4.78	1.51	1.32	1.58	1.29
(21) Reading own books at study	107	2.51	2.40	2.50	2.20	2.34	2.34	2.54	2.10	3.89	3.99	3.80	4.02
(22) Leaving during a test	107	1.31	1.40	1.38	1.16	1.48	1.47	1.49	1.33	4.37	4.55	4.50	4.54
(23) Grading papers during sing	106	1.92	2.03	2.10	1.80	1.68	1.80	1.90	1.67	4.13	4.19	4.18	4.15
(24) Threatening misbehavers	105	2.47	2.82	2.68	2.43	2.28	2.47	2.44	2.37	4.08	4.03	3.73	3.74
(25) Choosing books for pupils	102	3.07	3.21	2.82	3.04	2.86	2.85	2.69	2.94	3.21	2.97	3.19	2.83
(26) Visiting with parents at PTA	107	3.32	3.63	2.99	3.30	3.12	3.39	2.91	3.30	2.60	2.22	2.82	2.35

Table 3.1 (Contd)

Teacher Behavior Items	N	Expectations				Positive Norms				Negative Norms			
		Own	PO	T	SO	Own	PO	T	SO	Own	PO	T	SO
(27) Being partisan at football game	105	2.96	3.33	2.78	2.82	3.02	3.03	2.88	2.85	2.93	2.96	3.15	2.88
(28) Doing menial tasks at game	104	2.15	2.43	2.01	2.40	1.98	2.30	1.98	2.38	3.92	3.67	3.91	3.24
(29) Disciplining in cafeteria	107	3.30	3.35	3.19	3.47	3.04	3.14	3.07	3.22	2.91	2.79	2.87	2.16
(30) Participating in community	105	3.09	3.46	2.82	3.28	3.24	3.31	3.04	3.36	2.06	2.12	2.94	2.11
(31) Preparing lessons in reading	13	2.46	2.62	3.33	3.71	3.29	2.86	3.14	3.43	3.29	2.14	2.71	3.29
(32) Leaving study period	13	1.69	1.77	2.33	2.57	2.43	2.57	2.86	2.86	3.29	3.86	2.71	3.86
(33) Having pupils choose songs	13	3.15	3.23	2.67	2.71	2.57	2.67	2.71	2.71	3.57	4.14	3.71	4.17
(34) Telling parents about misbehav.	13	2.31	2.62	2.67	2.57	2.50	2.43	2.29	2.29	3.86	3.29	3.43	4.00
(35) Disciplining in library	13	2.92	3.08	4.17	4.29	4.29	4.33	4.43	4.14	1.57	2.33	1.71	1.71
(36) Sitting with T's in assembly	13	2.00	2.54	2.33	3.00	3.43	3.57	3.57	3.71	2.71	1.86	2.14	2.43
(37) Attending football game	13	3.31	3.15	2.83	3.43	3.14	3.14	3.00	3.14	1.57	1.29	2.14	2.57
(38) Participating in gym	13	3.23	2.92	2.67	2.57	2.86	3.00	2.71	3.00	2.29	2.14	2.29	1.71
(39) Grading	13	3.69	4.38	3.67	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.29	3.00	2.86	3.43	2.71	3.43
(40) Using alcohol out of school	13	1.38	1.62	1.83	2.29	2.29	2.29	2.57	2.29	3.86	3.29	3.00	3.29

Table 3.2 reports numbers of significant differences between attributed and own cognitions by type of cognition, sentient object group, and sign of mean difference. Throughout this Chapter, significance was computed utilizing the Mann-Whitney z_U as described in Volume C of this series 17/. The Mann-Whitney z_U is a statistic which tests the difference between two rank distributions and is directly comparable to the "t" test of differences between means. The z_U statistic, however, does not assume interval scale data, nor is it sensitive to non-normality of the distributions involved. In interpreting these data it may be assumed by the reader that z_U is a measure of the significance of difference between means; and since no signed hypotheses were utilized in the analysis of these data, all levels of significance reported are based upon a two-tailed test.

Table 3.2 reports numbers of mean differences which were significant at $p < .05$ or less. It should be noted that in Table 3.2 and all subsequent tables, a positive (+) difference indicates that the mean attributed cognition involved was significantly larger than the mean own cognition, while a negative (-) difference indicates a smaller mean attributed cognition.

Tables 3.3 through 3.9 report actual mean differences and their significance for selected items from Table 3.1. Items chosen for display were those for which it was reasonable to assume that significance of differences was not random. Eliminated were 21 items for which there were no significant differences between own and attributed cognitions or not more than one difference significant at $p < .05$. Decision was made to eliminate the latter group upon the assumption that one out of every twenty comparisons would be significant at $p < .05$ even if only random significance was involved, thus we would find it difficult to justify interpretation of items which revealed only one difference out of nine comparisons made at this level of confidence. (It should be noted that all items from sub-form 4-D showing significance were eliminated using this criterion--which only

Table 3.2

Numbers of Significant Differences Between Own and Attributed Cognitions Held by the Community

(Items 1 through 40 only - $p < .05$)

	Expectations		Positive Norms		Negative Norms		Totals
	≠*	=**	≠	=	≠	=	
PO - Own	11	0	8	1	0	6	26
T - Own	4	2	3	4	4	3	20
SO - Own	12	2	11	1	0	10	36
Totals	27	4	22	6	4	19	82

*Differences where the attributed cognition was significantly greater than the own cognition. **Differences where the own cognition was greater.

* * * * * * * * * * * * *

Table 3.3

Significant Differences Between Attributed and Own Cognitions for Test and Study Supervision

	Expectations	Positive Norms	Negative Norms
Item (1) Watching Pupils During Study Period			
PO - Own	≠ .47***	≠ .38***	= .56***
T - Own	≠ .32***	—	= .35*
SO - Own	≠ .71***	≠ .47***	= .64***
Item (2) Supervising Pupils in a Classroom Test			
PO - Own	—	—	—
T - Own	—	—	—
SO - Own	≠ .33**	—	—
Item (12) Watching for Cheaters During a Classroom Test			
PO - Own	≠ .52***	≠ .44***	= .70***
T - Own	—	—	—
SO - Own	≠ .55***	≠ .43***	= .90***

Note: In Tables 3.3 through 3.9, differences significant at $p < .05$ are indicated with a single asterisk, at $p < .01$ with two asterisks, at $p < .001$ with three asterisks.

shows that respondents are still needed in social science research.) The remaining 19 items (which accounted for 75 out of the 82 significant differences reported in Table 3.2) are grouped into tables which share both a common pattern of differences and a common content, and all differences which were actually significant for these items are displayed.

Findings

Findings will be reported in an arbitrary sequence, while reference will be made to tables as necessary.

General Findings. (1) There are more significant differences between own and attributed cognitions than we would expect from chance alone (see Table 3.2), hence we must conclude that the null hypothesis of no differences between own cognitions and those attributed to others is rejected. Similarly rejected is the hypothesis that respondents treat all sentient object groups similarly.

(2) The greatest number of significant differences between own and attributed cognitions may be found with the School Official sentient object group (see Table 3.2). The fewest number of differences are between own cognitions and those attributed to Teachers. Respondents feel that Teachers are both more likely to agree with themselves in expectations (or be more reality oriented with regard to teacher role) and more likely to share their values.

(3) People in General and School Officials are seen as expecting and wanting more teacher activity regardless of the nature of this activity. In Table 3.2 it may be seen that in both expectations and positive norms, People in General and School Officials are seen by respondents as holding numerically greater cognitions. Conversely, negative norms show differences in favor of the own cognition. No such difference may be found in the attributions to Teachers. This finding contrasts with summary statement 2.4 (from Chapter II), where others were seen as expecting and wanting less teacher activity. Redintegration of these two seemingly disparate findings is given in Chapter V.

Table 3.4

Significant Differences Between Attributed and Own Cognitions for Deviancy Control

	Expectations	Positive Norms	Negative Norms
Item (14) Telling Misbehaving Pupils in the Classroom to Stop Talking			
PO - Own	≠ .50***	≠ .40***	- .73***
T - Own	—	—	—
SO - Own	—	≠ .27*	- .60***

* * * * * * * * * * * * *

Table 3.5

Significant Differences Between Attributed and Own Cognitions for the Maintenance of Order

	Expectations	Positive Norms	Negative Norms
Item (7) Policing the Halls			
PO - Own	≠ .28*	≠ .32**	- .49*
T - Own	—	—	—
SO - Own	≠ .42***	≠ .54***	- .73***
Item (8) Disciplining Pupils During Basketball Game in the gym			
PO - Own	≠ .34*	—	—
T - Own	—	—	—
SO - Own	≠ .41**	≠ .35**	- .46*
Item (19) Supervising on the Playground			
PO - Own	≠ .13*	≠ .44***	- .40*
T - Own	—	—	—
SO - Own	≠ .42***	≠ .45***	- .57***
Item (29) Disciplining Pupils in Cafeteria			
PO - Own	—	—	—
T - Own	—	—	—
SO - Own	—	—	- .75**

(4) Although the differences are smaller, the greatest number of significant differences appears for differences between own and attributed expectations, with second and third place going to positive and negative norms respectively (see Table 3.2). Once again, this finding is in opposition to summary statement 2.3 (from Chapter II), and the relationship between the two findings is explored in Chapter V.

(5) Taken as a whole, there is indicated evidence for interaction (or cognitive slop-over) between all three types of cognitions. It will be observed (in Tables 3.3 through 3.10) that in no cases are the signs of significant expectational and positive norm differences disparate, and in no cases does the sign of a significant negative norm difference correspond with that of a positive norm difference or expectational difference. And it may also be observed (Table 3.1) that a correlation exists between any two rows of data. On the other hand, Tables 3.3 through 3.9 reveal a great many instances where significant expectational differences exist without corresponding significant normative differences, etc. Evidently, despite cognitive slop-over, a differentiated treatment is given by respondents to these three types of role cognitions held for the teacher.

(6) With the exception of two items (Item 1--Table 3.3 and Item 13--Table 3.6) Teachers are seen by respondents as holding cognitions which are in opposition to those held by People in General and School Officials. That is, where attributions made to these latter sentient object groups are significantly different from respondents' own cognitions, attributions to Teachers are either opposite in sign or do not exist at levels of significance; and vice versa. It is implied, therefore, that respondents see disparities between Teacher beliefs and values and those of People in General and School Officials as a major source of conflict in the teacher role. No such sharp disparity is seen between cognitions attributed to the latter two groups.

Table 3.6

Significant Differences Between Attributed and Own Cognitions for Structuring

	Expectations	Positive Norms	Negative Norms
Item (13) Having Pupils Sing Solos During a Classroom Singing Period			
PG - Own	+ .45***	+ .44***	- .57**
T - Own	+ .21*	+ .18*	—
SO - Own	+ .38***	+ .34**	- .50*

* * * * * * * * * * * *

Table 3.7

Significant Differences Between Attributed and Own Cognitions for Self-Indulgence

	Expectations	Positive Norms	Negative Norms
Item (3) Singing During a Classroom Singing Period			
PG - Own	—	—	—
T - Own	- .28**	- .29**	—
SO - Own	—	—	—
Item (9) Visiting with Other Teachers on the Playground			
PG - Own	—	- .28*	—
T - Own	+ .31**	+ .38***	- .89***
SO - Own	- .38**	- .24*	—
Item (11) Visiting with Other Teachers During Study Period			
PG - Own	—	—	—
T - Own	+ .46***	+ .59***	- .75***
SO - Own	—	—	—
Item (17) Allowing Pupils to Explore During Experiments in the Laboratory			
PG - Own	+ .42**	—	—
T - Own	—	- .35**	+ .49*
SO - Own	—	—	—

2

Teacher Control of Pupils. Considerably more than half of all significant differences between own and attributed cognitions for teacher behavior are concerned with problems of teacher supervision of pupils. Items involving this general area are displayed in Tables 3.3, 3.4, 3.5, and 3.6. An initial finding may be stated as applicable to all four of these tables, while two additional findings apply to differences among them.

(7) People in General and School Officials are seen by respondents as both wanting and expecting more teacher supervision and control of pupils than do respondents themselves. Such disparate expectations and norms are also occasionally attributed to teachers, but much less often. Taken as a whole, there is little difference seen between the norms and expectations of School Officials and People in General over this issue, and there is little evidence for a general dominance of norms or expectations in these differences.

In interpreting differences among Tables 3.3 through 3.6, the following model may be useful:

	Expectational differences are larger and more significant	Normative differences are larger and more significant
Cognitions attributed to People in General are larger and more significant	*Structuring* (Table 3.6)	*Deviancy Control* (Table 3.4)
Cognitions attributed to School Officials are larger and more significant	*Test and Study Supervision* (Table 3.3)	*Maintenance of Order* (Table 3.5)

(8) There is a slight tendency for more, larger and more significant differences between own and attributed expectations than between own and attributed norms for test and study supervision (Table 3.3) and the structuring for students (Table 3.6) by teachers. These items may be noted both for their lack of frequency of occurrence and in their moral "sensitivity." That is, whether

Table 3.8

Significant Differences Between Attributed and Own Cognitions for Community Participation

	Expectations	Positive Norms	Negative Norms
Item (6) Speaking Out at PTA Meeting in the Auditorium			
PG - Own	+ .33**	—	—
T - Own	—	—	+ .45*
SO - Own	—	—	—
Item (16) Attending PTA Meetings in the Auditorium			
PG - Own	+ .27**	+ .41***	- .20*
T - Own	- .31**	—	+ .66***
SO - Own	+ .40***	+ .45***	- .27*
Item (30) Participating in Community Activities out of School			
PG - Own	+ .38**	—	—
T - Own	—	—	+ .88***
SO - Own	—	—	—

* * * * * * * * * * * *

Table 3.9

Significant Differences Between Attributed and Own Cognitions for Non-Teaching Maintenance Functions

	Expectations	Positive Norms	Negative Norms
Item (15) Doing Own Studying and Grading in the Library			
PG - Own	—	+ .26*	—
T - Own	—	—	—
SO - Own	—	+ .29*	—
Item (20) Cooperating with the Principal in School			
PG - Own	—	—	—
T - Own	—	- .20*	—
SO - Own	+ .18***	+ .12*	—
Item (28) Doing Menial Tasks During Basketball Game in the Gym			
PG - Own	—	—	—
T - Own	—	—	—
SO - Own	—	+ .39**	- .68**

the teacher is administering a test or forcing pupils to sing, such behaviors (and the situations which call them forth) are both less frequent in occurrence and are morally "sensitive" issues in contrast to the control of classroom noise-makers or playground supervision which occur frequently and are morally neutral. Respondents seem to feel that for items of teacher behavior involving control of pupils that People in General and School Officials hold unreasonable expectations for teacher behavior in regions which are infrequent or morally "sensitive," but unreasonable norms for teacher behaviors in other regions.

(9) There is a slight tendency for more, larger and more significant differences between own cognitions and those attributed to School Officials for test and study supervision (Table 3.3) and the maintenance of order (Table 3.5). In contrast, People in General are seen as more concerned about structuring for pupils (Table 3.6) and deviancy control (Table 3.4). The former areas are distinct in that all items involved are "public" and involve issues upon which the school as an institution must take a stand. In contrast, deviancy control and teacher-pupil interaction over the singing of classroom solos must be considered a private problem upon which the school need not have taken a stand and which, in any case, is likely to be confined to the classroom. Respondents seem to feel that School Officials are more concerned about issues of public policy and both want and expect more teacher control of pupils in these areas, while People in General are more concerned about control problems which are private.

Self Indulgence. (10) In contrast with the four previous tables, Table 3.7 reveals a series of items which are characterized by a majority of significant differences between own cognitions and those attributed to Teachers. Within Table 3.7 it may be seen that respondents attribute to Teachers both desires and expectations for greater self-indulgence than are held by respondents. Thus, teachers are seen as desiring and expecting more visiting with other teachers, while less singing is both desired and expected and less encouraging of pupil independence is desired. (Note that Items (3) and (17) are inverted in sign; that is, for teachers to perform the behavior indicated is non-self indulgent.) Differences between own cognitions and those attributed to People in General and School Officials are few and exclusively counter to those where the Teacher sentient object group is involved. That respondents should see teachers as wanting a greater opportunity for visiting and a relief from onerous tasks is not surprising. That teachers should also expect such behaviors may possibly reflect merely cognitive slop-over from the dominant norms involved (note that normative differences are in all cases of greater magnitude than expectational differences). Or, respondents may see Teachers as attempting to justify an untenable norm with mistaken expectations held for others.

(11) It may also be observed in Table 3.7 that School Officials are seen as both expecting and wanting less teacher visiting with other teachers on the playground. This is surprising when viewed against the other items in Table 3.7 (especially Item 11, which deals with visiting during study periods) which show no School Official differences that are significant. It is possible that respondents feel that School Officials are overly sensitive to the playground because one can see teacher interaction within this setting.

(12) Finally, Table 3.7 also reveals that People in General expect an unreasonable amount of teacher encouragement of pupil experimentation in the laboratory, according to respondents. This finding comes from a single item which is, unfortunately, the only one submitted to respondents involving teacher encouragement of pupils, or indeed any other kind of positive teacher-pupil interaction. Speculating upon the meaning of this finding, we would assume that respondents felt People in General were naively optimistic about teacher classroom performance.

Community Participation. (13) Table 3.8 reveals still a different pattern of attributed responses. In three items dealing with community participation by the teacher, Teachers are seen by respondents as disapproving greater amounts of participation than respondents or others. This finding is all the more striking for being the only case in these data where the pattern of positive and negative norms was strikingly different. In other tables, positive and negative norm disparities are merely mirrors of one another. In Table 3.8, however, respondents see no differences between themselves and Teachers over how much teacher participation in community activities is desired. However, Teachers are seen as disapproving "A great deal of participation," while respondents tend to disapprove "Little or no participation." Besides justifying the independent utility of negative norms, this finding suggests that there exists a set of behavioral areas for which negative norms are likely to be more sensitive measures than positive norms (see Chapter V).

(14) Table 3.8 also offers additional support for the hypothesis of "naive optimism" among People in General. Respondents see People in General as significantly different from themselves in the amount of teacher participation in the community which they expect (but not necessarily want). People in General expect more attendance at and more speaking out at PTA meetings and more participation in community affairs.

(15) Finally, the sheer attendance of PTA meetings seems, to respondents, to be a sensitive issue for all sentient object groups. Both School Officials and People in General expect and want an unreasonable amount of teacher attendance, according to respondents. Teachers, in contrast, are seen to not only want but also to unreasonably expect less attendance. (The entire area of attendance and performance at PTA Meetings is a very sensitive one. In general, respondents attribute a disinterest in attendance to teachers, whereas teachers are concerned

about speaking out and the acceptance of direction from Parents and others. See Volumes 2, 3 and 4 of this series 16, 18, 19/.

Non-Teaching Maintenance Functions. (16) Table 3.9 concerns a set of three items which share only the quality of irrelevance to normal and manifest school functions. In general, these are seen as primarily the concern of School Officials. Respondents attribute to School Officials desires for more studying and grading in the library, more cooperation with the principal and more doing of menial tasks at basketball games.

(17) School Officials (read "Principals") are also seen as expecting more cooperation with themselves by teachers. Such wish-fulfilling distortions attributed by respondents to School Officials may be found in many items and add up to the rather surprising finding that respondents see School Officials as having the most distorted picture of behaviors which may be expected of teachers of all groups considered. It is suggested that such distortion (particularly in such areas as cooperation with the Principal, for who should know better than Principals?) may result from distorted wish-fulfillment by School Officials, from deceit by Teachers which is necessary for the operation of the school as an institution, or from a confusion as to the meaning of various types of role cognitions. We shall have more to say about this problem in Chapter V.

Summary

Once again, findings from the Community sample of the Role Study may be summarized into a number of general statements, while discussion of implications of these findings for role theory and the role of the teacher will be delayed until Chapter V.

3.1 Sufficient significant disparities between own and attributed cognitions exist to suggest that these phenomena are distinct, and such differences cut across all three types of cognitions considered (Finding 1).

3.2 Sentient object groups are treated uniquely by respondents (Finding 1).

3.3 The sentient object group felt by respondents to be most similar to themselves in norms and expectations is Teachers. The greatest number of differences is to be found between own cognitions and those attributed to School Officials who not only do not share respondents' values but also hold unreasonable expectations for teacher behavior (Finding 2).

3.4 People in General and School Officials are seen as both expecting and wanting more teacher activity regardless of the nature of this activity (Finding 3)

3.5 The greatest number of significant differences between own and attributed cognitions is assigned by respondents to expectations, with positive and negative norms trailing in that order (Finding 4).

3.6 In all cases, the signs of significant positive norm and expectational differences agree. In all cases, the signs of significant negative norm and positive norm (or expectational) differences disagree (Finding 5).

3.7 There is considerable general evidence for similarity between all types of cognitions reported, but there is also evidence that cognition types are treated uniquely in some instances (Findings 5, 8, 9, and 13).

3.8 With minor exceptions, differences between own cognitions and those attributed to teachers are opposite to those generated by attributions to School Officials and People in General; teachers are seen in opposition to these latter groups (Finding 6).

3.9 People in General and School Officials are seen by respondents as both wanting and expecting more teacher supervision and control of pupils than do respondents themselves. Teachers show slight tendencies for these same expectations and norms (Finding 7).

3.10 Respondents feel that People in General and School Officials hold unreasonable expectations for teacher control of pupils in areas which are infrequent or morally "sensitive," but unreasonable norms for teacher controlling behaviors in other regions (Finding 8).

3.11 Respondents feel that School Officials are more concerned about teacher control of pupils in areas where public policy prevails, while People in General are more concerned about control problems which are private (Finding 9).

3.12 Respondents see Teachers as primarily desiring, and to a lesser extent expecting, more self-indulgent behaviors of teachers than respondents do themselves (Finding 10).

3.13 School Officials are seen by respondents as both expecting and wanting less teacher visiting with other teachers, but only on the playground (possibly a public place where such behavior is visible--Finding 11).

3.14 People in General exhibit naive optimism about teacher encouragement of pupil experimentation and community participation by teachers (Findings 12 and 14).

3.15 Whereas Teachers are seen by respondents as not differing with themselves in amount of community participation approved, Teachers are seen as disapproving a great deal of community participation while respondents tend to disapprove of little or no community participation by teachers (Finding 13).

3.16 Both School Officials and People in General are seen by respondents as unreasonably approving and expecting teacher attendance at PTA meetings (Finding 15).

3.17 Respondents see School Officials as desirous of more performance of non-teaching maintenance functions by teachers (Finding 16).

3.18 Respondents also see School Officials as expecting significantly more teacher cooperation with principals than do respondents (Finding 17).

CHAPTER IV

OWN AND ATTRIBUTED COGNITIONS FOR TEACHERS HELD BY STUDENTS - RESULTS FROM THE ROLE STUDY

Introduction

This Chapter presents results from the Student sample in the Role Study. As in Chapters II and III, data are first presented in a series of tables; findings are identified and discussed briefly, and a table of summary statements is presented. Occasional interpretations are made of relationships between these data and those of Chapters II and III; but the bulk of applications of these findings to role theory and the role of the teacher are, again, left until Chapter V.

Tables of Results

The basic data from which this Chapter is derived are given in Table 4.1. It may be seen that Table 4.1 lists means for own and attributed cognitions for expectations, positive norms, and negative norms. These data were drawn from the group of student respondents as a whole. That is, all means were computed by summing together the responses from an arbitrary sample of three groups of undergraduate students (education majors, majors in other fields, and students who had not yet decided upon a major) and dividing by the total number of student respondents. This particular group of students over-samples education majors, as approximately half of respondents fell into this category. In contrast with Table 3.1 of Chapter III, all 50 items from the five sub-forms of Form 4 are included within Table 4.1; and it may be observed that sufficient number of respondents are available for all items to give some promise of significant comparisons.

Table 4.2 reports numbers or significant differences between attributed and own cognitions by type of cognition, sentient object group, and sign of mean difference. Throughout this Chapter, significance was computed utilizing the Mann-Whitney z_U as previously discussed in Chapter III and described in Volume C, and

Table 4.1

Student Means for Own and Attributed Cognitions for Public School Teacher Behaviors (Pilot Study Data)

Teacher Behavior Items	N	Expectations				Positive Norms				Negative Norms			
		Own	PG	T	SO	Own	PG	T	SO	Own	PG	T	SO
(1) Watching pupils study	42	3.33	3.65	3.50	3.95	3.38	3.95	3.55	4.19	2.56	1.42	1.51	1.20
(2) Supervising class test	42	3.88	4.30	3.90	4.21	3.60	4.12	3.90	4.33	2.07	1.55	1.64	1.39
(3) Singing along	41	3.51	3.67	3.05	3.74	3.24	3.62	3.12	3.88	2.62	1.58	2.18	1.50
(4) Ignoring misbehavior	41	1.88	2.16	2.00	1.69	1.85	1.80	1.88	1.46	4.15	4.28	4.49	4.80
(5) Keeping library quiet	41	4.17	4.05	4.21	4.33	4.00	4.08	4.18	4.32	1.52	1.18	1.10	1.10
(6) Speaking out at PTA	41	2.77	3.00	2.90	3.43	2.15	3.05	3.05	3.39	2.93	3.02	3.26	2.15
(7) Policing the halls	40	2.81	3.52	3.10	3.95	2.92	3.58	3.05	3.88	3.05	1.51	2.36	1.40
(8) Disciplining at basketball game	41	2.14	2.71	2.50	2.93	2.22	2.42	2.79	3.24	4.10	3.15	2.92	2.03
(9) Visiting T's on playground	41	2.84	2.79	3.07	1.93	2.51	2.18	3.18	2.02	3.67	4.45	2.59	4.18
(10) Cooperating with teachers	42	4.17	3.98	4.19	4.74	4.57	4.48	4.50	4.68	1.10	1.10	1.08	1.15
(11) Visiting T's during study	36	1.95	2.05	2.29	1.57	1.64	1.79	2.44	1.48	4.43	4.32	4.03	4.82
(12) Watching for cheaters	37	3.36	4.26	3.61	4.32	2.92	3.97	3.29	4.24	3.72	1.71	2.74	1.61
(13) Having pupils sing solos	35	2.03	2.61	2.44	2.68	2.26	3.06	2.56	2.84	4.09	3.12	3.78	3.36
(14) Telling pupils stop talking	37	3.50	4.03	3.16	3.43	2.70	3.40	3.03	3.36	3.67	3.03	2.91	2.12
(15) Studying in library	36	2.87	3.49	2.97	3.44	3.03	3.44	2.97	3.58	2.51	2.21	2.85	2.33
(16) Attending PTA meetings	35	4.08	4.44	3.97	4.65	3.83	4.49	3.76	4.64	1.86	1.24	1.79	1.18

Note: See footnote to Table 3.1.

Table 4.1 (Contd)

Teacher Behavior Items	N	Expectations				Positive Norms				Negative Norms			
		Own	PG	T	SO	Own	PG	T	SO	Own	PG	T	SO
(17) Allowing exploration in lab.	36	3.00	3.00	2.89	3.03	3.61	3.53	3.21	3.15	2.00	2.68	2.94	2.88
(18) Kibitsing during basketball game	36	2.03	2.34	2.17	2.03	2.06	2.09	2.00	2.00	3.97	4.06	4.23	4.00
(19) Supervising on playground	36	3.13	3.97	3.34	4.03	3.14	4.22	3.52	4.06	2.81	1.55	2.44	1.69
(20) Cooperating with principal	37	4.49	4.67	4.32	4.89	4.30	4.68	4.26	4.82	1.33	1.12	1.62	1.15
(21) Reading own books at study	80	2.58	2.53	2.56	2.22	2.80	2.35	2.75	2.25	3.23	3.86	3.10	3.83
(22) Leaving a test	80	1.48	1.28	1.57	1.27	1.72	1.42	1.58	1.29	4.50	4.68	4.62	4.77
(23) Grading papers during sing	80	1.64	1.90	1.98	1.51	1.46	1.58	1.87	1.39	4.64	4.64	4.46	4.69
(24) Threatening misbehavers	80	2.74	3.17	2.96	2.48	2.12	2.29	2.59	2.34	4.21	3.96	3.26	3.74
(25) Choosing books for pupils	81	3.07	3.38	3.11	3.38	2.82	3.32	3.13	3.36	3.52	2.24	2.81	2.32
(26) Visiting with parents at PTA	81	3.65	4.14	3.37	4.22	3.68	4.24	3.26	4.23	1.76	1.35	2.71	1.42
(27) Being partisan at football game	80	3.04	3.15	2.72	2.68	3.21	3.26	2.72	3.03	2.65	2.62	3.26	2.64
(28) Doing menial tasks at game	81	1.94	2.11	2.07	2.40	1.85	2.45	1.99	2.57	4.33	3.36	4.16	3.06
(29) Disciplining in cafeteria	79	2.84	3.33	3.24	3.48	2.58	3.06	2.95	3.28	3.36	3.28	2.54	2.12
(30) Participating in community	81	3.12	3.70	3.04	3.94	3.32	3.89	3.12	3.92	1.97	1.64	2.80	1.49
(31) Preparing lessons in reading	43	2.63	3.05	2.76	2.98	2.81	3.02	2.98	3.05	3.25	3.09	3.13	3.10
(32) Leaving study period	42	1.74	1.77	1.88	1.38	1.90	1.67	2.00	1.52	4.12	4.67	4.40	4.75
(33) Having pupils choose songs	43	3.42	3.26	3.22	2.98	3.56	3.51	3.24	3.42	2.00	2.20	2.36	2.56

Table 4.1 (Contd)

Teacher Behavior Items	N	Expectations				Positive Norms				Negative Norms			
		Own	PG	T	SO	Own	PG	T	SO	Own	PG	T	SO
(34) Telling parents about misbehav.	43	2.51	3.35	2.63	2.90	2.72	2.89	2.58	2.79	4.07	3.96	4.33	4.00
(35) Disciplining in library	43	3.21	3.79	3.39	3.60	3.00	3.38	3.13	3.44	3.20	2.91	2.67	2.47
(36) Sitting with T's in assembly	41	2.46	2.95	2.07	2.07	2.51	2.33	2.40	2.40	3.83	3.83	3.28	4.14
(37) Attending football games	43	3.02	3.37	2.82	3.52	3.30	3.70	3.17	3.47	1.90	1.36	2.05	1.39
(38) Participating in gym	42	2.86	2.86	2.78	3.19	3.40	3.53	3.02	3.55	2.50	2.13	2.76	1.81
(39) Grading	44	3.83	4.21	3.80	3.82	3.30	3.69	3.38	3.62	3.10	2.46	2.92	2.19
(40) Using alcohol out of school	43	2.05	1.34	1.88	1.40	2.02	1.42	1.80	1.41	4.44	4.56	4.56	4.76
(41) Preparing lessons at recess	30	2.48	2.81	2.74	2.68	2.57	2.93	2.97	2.70	3.59	3.08	3.14	3.39
(42) Grading papers during test	30	2.97	2.68	2.87	2.45	2.77	2.56	2.81	3.00	3.28	3.00	3.14	2.64
(43) Punishing misbehavers	29	3.10	3.23	3.43	3.45	3.10	3.11	3.42	3.31	3.48	2.80	2.57	2.44
(44) Sending misbehavers to princ.	30	1.93	2.87	2.36	2.45	2.27	2.59	2.37	2.43	4.74	3.40	3.86	4.10
(45) Only listening at PTA	30	3.63	3.55	3.58	3.55	3.28	3.52	3.55	3.30	2.62	2.12	2.14	2.44
(46) Correcting pupils at assembly	30	2.42	3.00	3.03	3.39	2.67	3.11	3.26	2.87	4.00	2.76	2.62	3.07
(47) Maintaining order at football game	30	1.97	2.90	2.40	3.23	2.90	2.93	3.19	2.62	3.93	2.84	2.48	3.25
(48) Visiting with T's at track	29	3.13	2.90	3.13	2.64	3.03	3.11	2.87	3.17	2.83	3.32	3.21	2.11
(49) Disciplining pupils	30	3.45	3.48	3.39	3.68	3.13	3.37	3.81	3.50	3.00	2.50	1.76	2.50
(50) Smoking out of school	29	2.23	2.48	2.93	2.39	2.38	2.22	2.23	2.41	4.00	4.79	4.74	4.50

once again, a two-tailed test was used throughout. Table 4.2 reports numbers of mean differences which were significant at $p < .05$ or less. It should be noted that in Table 4.2 and all subsequent tables, a positive (+) difference indicates that the mean attributed cognition involved was significantly larger than the mean own cognition, while a negative (-) difference indicates a smaller mean attributed cognition.

Tables 4.3 through 4.11 report actual mean differences and their significance for selected items from Table 4.1. Items chosen for display were those for which it was reasonable to assume that significance of differences were not random. As in Chapter III, items were eliminated which showed no more than one difference significant at $p < .05$ (out of nine comparisons examined). Out of 50 items originally examined, 40 showed at least one significant difference between own and attributed cognitions, whereas only 33 items are reportable in Tables 4.3 through 4.11 under the criterion used.

Findings

In the following section, findings are reported in an arbitrary sequence, references are made to tables as needed.

General Findings. At the level of generalities which cut across item content, there was similarity between student and community data in the Role Study. This resemblence is explored more fully in Chapter V, but most of the general findings of Chapter III also apply to the student sample.

(1) There are more significant differences between own and attributed cognitions than one would expect by chance alone (see Table 4.2); and, once again, respondents appear to treat sentient object groups distinctly.

(2) The greatest number of significant differences between own and attributed cognitions is found where the sentient object is School Officials, while Teachers are seen by respondents as being most similar to themselves in both norms and expectations held (see Table 4.2).

Table 4.2

Numbers of Significant Differences Between Own and Attributed Cognitions Held by the Community

(Items 1 through 50, - $p < .05$)

	Expectations		Positive Norms		Negative Norms		Totals
	+*	-**	+	-	+	-	
PG - Own	15	2	15	2	1	12	47
T - Own	5	1	8	2	3	10	29
SO - Own	18	6	16	7	1	13	61
Totals	38	9	39	11	5	35	137

*Differences where the attributed cognition was significantly greater than the own cognition. **Differences where the own cognition was greater.

* * * * * * * * * * * *

Table 4.3

Significant Differences Between Attributed and Own Cognitions for Deviancy Control

	Expectations	Positive Norms	Negative Norms
Item (4) Ignoring Pupils Misbehaving in a Classroom			
PG - Own	—	—	—
T - Own	—	—	—
SO - Own	—	-.39*	+.65*
Item (14) Telling Misbehaving Pupils in the Classroom to Stop Talking			
PG - Own	+.52*	+.70*	—
T - Own	—	—	—
SO - Own	—	+.66**	-1.54**
Item (44) Sending Pupils Misbehaving in the Classroom to the Principal's Office			
PG - Own	+.94***	—	—
T - Own	+.42*	—	—
SO - Own	—	—	—

Note: In Tables 4.3 through 4.11, differences significant at $p < .05$ are indicated with a single asterisk, at $p < .01$ with two asterisks, at $p < .001$ with three asterisks.

(3) People in General and School Officials are seen as expecting and wanting more teacher activity regardless of the nature of this activity (see Table 4.2). However, in contrast with the findings of Chapter III, Teachers are also seen by student respondents (though to a lesser degree than other sentient object groups) as both expecting and wanting more activity (once again, see Table 4.2).

(4) Table 4.2 shows no difference in number of significant disparities which favors either positive norms or expectations, but both of these types of disparities are more numerous than those for negative norms.

(5) Once more, taken as a whole, there is evidence for interaction between the three types of cognitions (or cognitive slop-over). It may be observed (in Tables 4.3 through 4.11) that in no cases are the signs of significant expectational and positive norm differences disparate, while in no cases does the sign of a significant negative norm difference agree with either of the former. Any two rows of student responses are, once again, correlated (Table 4.1). In contrast, once again, Tables 4.3 through 4.11 reveal a number of instances where significant expectational differences exist without corresponding significant normative differences, etc.

(6) However, there is a real difference between the student data and those of community members in the attribution of cognitions to Teachers which are disparate from those of the other two sentient object groups. In Tables 4.3 through 4.11 there may be found thirteen items for which significant differences exist between own cognitions and those attributed to Teachers and between own cognitions and those attributed to another sentient object group. Assuming a uniformity of signs for expectational and positive norm differences and a reversal of sign for negative norm differences, nine out of these thirteen items show Teachers in agreement with People in General or with School Officials (who are never in disagreement). This agreement, by the way, is to be found exclusively in the general area of teacher control of pupils

Table 4.4

Significant Differences Between Attributed and Own Cognitions for Supervision and the Maintenance of Order

	Expectations	Positive Norms	Negative Norms
Item (1) Watching Pupils During Study Period			
PG - Own	—	+ .57**	-1.14**
T - Own	—	—	-1.05**
SO - Own	+ .63***	+ .81***	-1.46***
Item (2) Supervising Pupils in a Classroom Test			
PG - Own	+ .42*	+ .53*	—
T - Own	—	—	—
SO - Own	+ .33*	+ .74***	—
Item (7) Policing the Halls			
PG - Own	+ .71**	+ .65**	-1.53***
T - Own	—	—	—
SO - Own	+1.14***	+ .95***	-1.64***
Item (8) Disciplining Pupils During Basketball Game in Gym			
PG - Own	+ .57*	—	-1.05*
T - Own	—	+ .56*	-1.19**
SO - Own	+ .78**	+1.02***	-2.08***
Item (12) Watching for Cheaters During a Classroom Test			
PG - Own	+ .90***	+1.06***	-1.99***
T - Own	—	—	-1.02*
SO - Own	+ .97***	+1.32***	-2.11***
Item (19) Supervising on Playground			
PG - Own	+ .85***	+1.08***	-1.27**
T - Own	—	—	—
SO - Own	+ .90***	+ .93***	-1.13*
Item (29) Disciplining Pupils in Cafeteria			
PG - Own	+ .50**	+ .48*	—
T - Own	+ .40*	+ .36*	- .82*
SO - Own	+ .64***	+ .69***	-1.24***

(where the only two agreeing items from the community data in Chapter III were also found). However, it seems clear that student respondents do not see as many issues of conflict between Teachers and School Officials or People in General as are seen by community respondents.

A number of other general differences may be noted between the community responses of Chapter III and the student responses of Chapter IV, but these are left for discussion until Chapter V. In examining next the specific items an attempt has been made to organize the Tables of Chapter IV in a pattern which is similar to that used in Chapter III. A rough equivalence may be made between the following Tables:

Chapter IV		Chapter III
Table 4.3	=	Table 3.4
Table 4.4	=	Tables 3.3 + 3.5
Table 4.5 is unique		
Table 4.6	=	Table 3.6
Table 4.7 is unique		
Table 4.8	=	Table 3.7
Table 4.9	=	Table 3.8
Table 4.10	=	Table 3.9
Table 4.11 is unique		

Teacher Control of Pupils. Tables 4.3 through 4.7 present a set of 17 items which together account for considerably more than half of all significant differences between own and attributed cognitions and which are concerned with the teacher's supervision of and control over pupils. Findings in this area are in part similar to and in part distinct from those of Chapter III. In particular, the distinction which appeared in Chapter III between Tables 3.3 and 3.5 (and summary statement 3.10) do not apply in the student data.

(7) Respondents see great differences between themselves and both People

Table 4.4 (Contd)

	Expectations	Positive Norms	Negative Norms
Item (35) Disciplining Pupils During Reading Period in Library			
PG - Own	+ .59*	—	—
T - Own	—	—	—
SO - Own	—	—	-1.04*

* * * * * * * * * * * * *

Table 4.5

Significant Differences Between Attributed and Own Cognitions for "Gratuitous" Control Duties

	Expectations	Positive Norms	Negative Norms
Item (46) Correcting Pupils During an Assembly in the Auditorium			
PG - Own	+ .58*	—	-1.24**
T - Own	+ .61**	+ .59*	-1.38**
SO - Own	+ .97***	—	—
Item (47) Maintaining Order During Football Game on Athletic Field			
PG - Own	+ .94*	—	- .91*
T - Own	—	—	-1.45**
SO - Own	+1.26***	—	—

* * * * * * * * * * * * *

Table 4.6

Significant Differences Between Attributed and Own Cognitions for Structuring

	Expectations	Positive Norms	Negative Norms
Item (13) Having Pupils Sing Solos During a Classroom Singing Period			
PG - Own	—	+ .81*	- .96*
T - Own	—	—	—
SO - Own	+ .65*	+ .58*	—
Item (25) Choosing Books for Pupils in the Classroom			
PG - Own	—	+ .51**	-1.38**
T - Own	—	—	- .71*
SO - Own	—	+ .54**	-1.20***

in General and School Officials over issues of teacher supervision of pupils and the maintenance of order (Table 4.4). These differences are universally in favor of others expecting and wanting more control than respondents do. Expectational and normative differences tend to be of the same magnitude. There is, however, a slight tendency to attribute an even greater difference to School Officials than to People in General. In those few cases where significant differences also appear for Teachers, the latter are seen as agreeing with School Officials and People in General, but the magnitude of teacher differences is always much less.

(8) In contrast, respondents see smaller and fewer differences between themselves and others over issues of deviancy control (Table 4.3), although the signs of all differences reported are similar to those of Table 4.4. School Officials are seen, for instance, as not wanting teachers to ignore pupil misbehavior and in favor of telling misbehaving pupils to stop talking. No expectational differences appear for School Officials.

(9) However, in the same Table it may be seen that a strong expectation is attributed to People in General that teachers will send pupil deviants to the principal's office. This is matched, according to respondents, by no significant differences for the norms of People in General or for any significant differences at all for School Officials. Evidently respondents attribute a simple stereotype for this kind of behavior to People in General; a stereotype which is, by the way, not attributed to People in General by the community respondents.

(10) Table 4.5 shows a unique finding for two items which may be construed as constituting, for teachers, "gratuitous" control responsibilities. It may be observed that, in contrast with Tables 4.3 and 4.4, School Officials are seen as expecting (but not particularly desiring) teachers to correct pupils during assembly and to maintain order on the football field. If not

Table 4.7

Significant Differences Between Attributed and Own Cognitions for Threats and General Discipline

	Expectations	Positive Norms	Negative Norms
Item (24) Threatening Pupils Misbehaving in the Classroom			
PG - Own	—	—	—
T - Own	—	+ .47*	-1.05**
SO - Own	—	—	—
Item (49) Disciplining Pupils in School			
PG - Own	—	—	—
T - Own	—	+ .67*	-1.25**
SO - Own	—	—	—

* * * * * * * * * * * * *

Table 4.8

Significant Differences Between Attributed and Own Cognitions for Self-Indulgence

	Expectations	Positive Norms	Negative Norms
Item (3) Singing During a Classroom Singing Period			
PG - Own	—	—	-1.05**
T - Own	- .47*	—	—
SO - Own	—	+ .63*	-1.12**
Item (9) Visiting with Other Teachers on the Playground			
PG - Own	—	—	+ .78*
T - Own	—	+ .66**	-1.08*
SO - Own	- .91**	- .51*	—
Item (11) Visiting with Other Teachers During Study Period			
PG - Own	—	—	—
T - Own	—	+ .81**	—
SO - Own	—	—	—
Item (23) Grading Papers During a Classroom Singing Period			
PG - Own	—	—	—
T - Own	+ .33*	+ .41**	—
SO - Own	—	—	—

because School Officials desire teachers to do these jobs, why do teachers do them? According to respondents, because they feel strongly that the jobs _should_ be performed! Finally, People in General tend to agree with both the expectations of School Officials and the norms of Teachers, although the differences are smaller. ..... The only difficulty is, according to respondents, that all others are incorrect; teachers do not, in fact, perform these responsibilities as much as they are expected to by School Officials! (This particularly complex finding is not observable for the maintenance of order at basketball games or in the cafeteria, where respondents feel that School Officials approve of teachers assuming extra responsibility.)

(11) As in Table 3.6, Table 4.6 reveals that both School Officials and People in General are assumed by respondents to want more pressures upon pupils to sing solos and choosing of books for pupils than they themselves want. However, in opposition to Table 3.6, respondents are _not_ convinced that these sentient object groups have distorted expectations in this field. According to student respondents, then, People in General and School Officials are guilty of wanting more teacher structuring but not of expectational distortion in this area.

(12) Table 4.7 reveals two unique items which differ completely from the other items of teacher control and discipline of pupils. Respondents see Teachers as wanting more threats delivered to pupil deviants and more general discipline in school than respondents themselves want. These findings, which picture the teacher as a stern disciplinarian, are quite distinct from other items in both Chapters III and IV. Chapter III emphasizes over and again the fact that community respondents expect People in General and School Officials - but _not_ Teachers - to want more control and discipline. Tables 4.3 through 4.6 show a similar pattern of responses from student respondents where if teachers have any disparate norms at all they tend only to mirror the norms of the other

Table 4.9

Significant Differences Between Attributed and
Own Cognitions for Community Activities

	Expectations	Positive Norms	Negative Norms
Item (6) Speaking Out at PTA Meeting in the Auditorium			
PG - Own	—	—	—
T - Own	—	—	—
SO - Own	+ .66**	—	—
Item (16) Attending PTA Meetings in the Auditorium			
PG - Own	+ .36*	+ .66*	—
T - Own	—	—	—
SO - Own	+ .57**	+ .81***	- .67*
Item (26) Visiting with Parents During PTA Meeting in the Auditorium			
PG - Own	+ .49**	+ .56***	—
T - Own	—	- .41*	+ .95**
SO - Own	+ .58***	+ .56***	—
Item (30) Participating in Community Activities out of School			
PG - Own	+ .58***	+ .56***	—
T - Own	—	—	+ .72**
SO - Own	+ .72***	+ .60***	—
Item (40) Using Alcohol out of School			
PG - Own	- .70***	- .60**	—
T - Own	—	—	—
SO - Own	- .64***	- .61**	—

sentient object groups. The only possible previous model is in Table 4.5 where Teachers are seen as favoring additional control in areas of "gratuitous" control duties. We are now informed, however, that Teachers feel pupils ought to be threatened and generally disciplined, whereas this feeling is neither shared by respondents nor attributed to others. As with Table 4.5, we interpret this finding to suggest that student respondents attribute to Teachers personal needs for job performance that transcend the demands of either boss or client! At any rate, Tables 4.5 and 4.7 imply that for student respondents Teachers are seen as desiring a sterner posture of disciplinarian, even though (according to respondents) they do not differ in expectations. It does not have to be added that community respondents do not make such attributions.

Self-Indulgence (13) Table 4.8, dealing with teacher self-indulgence, shows a pattern only slightly different from that shown in Table 3.7. Student respondents, once again, see Teachers as wanting more visiting, more inappropriate grading of papers, more self-indulgence. On the other hand, there is but little evidence to suggest that for student respondents, Teachers are felt to expect more self-indulging behavior.

(14) It may also be observed in Table 4.8 that People in General and School Officials are felt to desire more singing during the singing period by teachers than is desired by respondents. Also, School Officials both expect and want less teacher visiting on the playground (as in Chapter III). Other differences attributed to these sentient object groups are of lesser magnitude - but once again are disparate in sign from those of the teacher. It should also be noted that Item 17 - the encouraging of pupil exploration in the laboratory by teachers, is missing from Table 4.8.

Community Activities. Table 4.9 is similar to Table 3.8 - to a point. It will be recalled that the former dealt strictly with teacher participation in

Table 4.10

Significant Differences Between Attributed and Own Cognitions for Non-Teaching Maintenance Functions

	Expectations	Positive Norms	Negative Norms
Item (10) Cooperating with Other Teachers in School			
PG - Own	—	—	—
T - Own	—	—	—
SO - Own	+ .57***	—	—
Item (20) Cooperating with the Principal in School			
PG - Own	—	+ .38*	—
T - Own	—	—	—
SO - Own	+ .41**	+ .53***	—
Item (28) Doing Menial Tasks During Basketball Game in Gym			
PG - Own	—	+ .59**	- .97***
T - Own	—	—	—
SO - Own	+ .47*	+ .72***	-1.28***

* * * * * * * * * * * * * *

Table 4.11

Significant Differences Between Attributed and Own Cognitions for Teaching-Related Maintenance Functions

	Expectations	Positive Norms	Negative Norms
Item (21) Reading Own Books During Study Period			
PG - Own	—	—	+ .63*
T - Own	—	—	—
SO - Own	- .36*	- .55*	+ .60*
Item (22) Leaving the Room During a Classroom Test			
PG - Own	- .19*	- .30*	—
T - Own	—	—	—
SO - Own	—	- .44**	—
Item (39) Grading Pupils in School			
PG - Own	+ .38*	+ .39*	—
T - Own	—	—	—
SO - Own	—	—	- .91*

community activities, while Table 4.9 includes Item 40 - the use of alcohol. This last item exhibits a pattern of differences which is similar (but opposite in sign) to the others to be found in the table, and our interpretation includes it.

(15) It may be seen in Table 4.9 that People in General and School Officials are seen as favoring teacher participation in community activities and as disapproving the use of alcohol by teachers, in contrast with respondents. It is interesting to speculate why no negative norm differences appear for these data while they are also weak to non-existent in Table 3.8. It is probable that whereas a teacher "may" visit with parents, for instance, either frequently or infrequently, that the only point which is unambiguously disapproved is no visiting with parents at all. With a wide range of "allowable" behaviors and a narrow range of "prohibited" behaviors, we would expect little differences in negative norms between groups or sentient object groups. Positive norms would also show less variability if there were a narrow range of "allowable" behaviors.

(16) Table 4.9 also reveals that respondents assume that Teachers are less in favor of visiting with parents at PTA meetings and in community participation. They miss (as do community respondents) the actual critical attitudes of teachers towards speaking out at PTA meetings.

Maintenance Functions. (17) Once again, student respondents attribute to School Officials the primary concern for and expectations connected with non-teaching maintenance functions (see Table 4.10). It will be observed that expectational distortion by School Officials takes place for both questions dealing with cooperation and with the issue of menial tasks. Norms also appear for cooperation with the principal and the menial task issue.

(18) However, according to student respondents, People in General are also unreasonably in favor of teachers doing menial tasks. This finding does not appear in Chapter III.

(19) Table 4.11 is unique to Chapter IV and deals with a set of four items sharing low levels of significance and a common relationship to teaching-related maintenance functions. Respondents generally see School Officials and People in General as both favoring and expecting less reading of books, leaving a test, and leaving a study hall by teachers, and more grading. None of these findings are strong enough to be worth a great deal of interpretation.

Summary

Once more, findings from the Student sample of the Role Study may be summarized into a number of general statements. Discussion of implications of these findings and a systematic review of their relationships to those of Chapters II and III will be delayed until Chapter V.

4.1 Sufficient significant disparities exist between own and attributed cognitions to imply that these are independent phenomena for student respondents (Finding 1).

4.2 Once again, respondents appear to treat sentient object groups distinctly (Finding 1).

4.3 Teachers are seen by respondents to be most similar to themselves in both norms and expectations, while School Officials are seen as most different (Finding 2).

4.4 People in General and School Officials are seen as expecting and wanting more teacher activity than respondents, and to a much lesser extent, Teachers are also seen as following these same tendencies (Finding 3).

4.5 There are no differences between numbers of significant findings for expectations and positive norms, although there are fewer significant negative norm differences between own and attributed cognitions (Finding 4).

4.6 In all cases, the signs of significant positive norm and expectational differences agree, while in all cases negative norm differences which are significant disagree with the first two (Finding 5).

4.7 There is considerable general evidence for similarity between all types of cognitions reported, but there is also evidence that cognition types are treated uniquely in some instances (Findings 5, 10, 11, 12, 13, and 15).

4.8 Teachers are seen by respondents to be in agreement (although with less vehemence) with People in General and School Officials in wanting and expecting more discipline and control of pupils than do respondents. In other areas, Teachers are seen as holding cognitions which run counter to those of the other sentient object groups. There is small evidence for general disagreement between teachers and others in the school system in the data from Chapter IV (Finding 6).

4.9 Respondents see School Officials and People in General as being more in favor of and expecting more teacher control and discipline of pupils than do respondents themselves. There is also a slight tendency for greater differences to be attributed to School Officials (Findings 7 and 8).

4.10 There is also some tendency for Teachers to want and expect more more control, although the differences are much smaller, according to respondents, than those for the other sentient object groups (Finding 7).

4.11 The disparities attributed to People in General and to School Officials are smaller for issues of deviancy control than they are for issues of general pupil control and discipline, and no significant differences appear for expectations of School Officials (Finding 8).

4.12 Respondents see People in General as having false expectations of of many teachers sending pupils to the principal (Finding 9) and being unreasonably in favor of teachers doing menial tasks (Finding 18).

4.13 Respondents see Teachers as approving more performance of gratuitous control responsibilities (Finding 10), wanting more threats and general discipline of pupils (Finding 12); and desiring more self-indulgence (Finding 13).

4.14 School Officials are seen as expecting more gratuitous control

responsibilities of teachers (but not of approving more) (Finding 10), and both expecting and wanting less visiting with other teachers on the playground (Finding 14).

4.15 Both School Officials and People in General are felt to want more teacher structuring than respondents do, but this is not matched by expectational distortion (Finding 11).

4.16 School Officials and People in General are felt to want more singing in the singing period by teachers than do respondents (Finding 14).

4.17 People in General and School Officials are seen by respondents as strongly in favor of teacher participation in community activities and strongly against the use of alcohol. Moreover, they also expect more and less of these activities respectively. Finally, there appear to be few significant negative norm differences over these issues (Finding 16).

4.18 Respondents feel that Teachers are less in favor of visiting with Parents at PTA than respondents are (Finding 16).

4.19 Respondents attribute to School Officials unreasonable expectations and desires for teacher performance of non-teaching maintenance functions (Finding 17).

4.20 School Officials and People in General are seen by respondents as expecting and wanting more teacher performance of teaching-related maintenance functions, although the differences reported are not large (Finding 19).

CHAPTER V

RESULTS AND THEIR IMPLICATIONS

Introduction

The interpretation of the many findings of the three studies reported here is a difficult task. In general, two methods of summary will be used: First of all, findings will be summarized utilizing the prominent theoretical and methodological dimensions along which the text has been organized. In this first summary we will lean heavily upon five figures which show the findings of the three studies in comparison. Then results will be resummarized in terms of implications both for role theory and for the role of the teacher. The Chapter will conclude with a series of recommendations.

Summary of Findings

Figures 5.1 through 5.5 present a brief summary of findings appearing in Chapters II, III, and IV. It will be observed that these Figures are organized into propositional statements arranged into two columns. In the left-hand column are reported findings which stem from two or more of the studies and for which no contradicting evidence was found. In the right-hand column are reported findings which appeared in only one of the studies or for which directly contradictory evidence was obtained. Figure 5.1 deals with general propositions and statements about types of cognition. Figures 5.2 through 5.5 deal with findings for Students, Teachers, People in General and Parents, and School Officials as sentient object groups respectively. References in these Figures refer to the summary statements found concluding Chapters II, III, and IV. Subsequent discussion in this Chapter will draw mainly from these five Figures.

Figure 5.1—General Findings

Similarities

(1) Own and Attributed cognitions for the teacher are distinct. In all three studies many and patterned differences exist between cognitions held by respondents and those attributed by respondents to others. (2.1, 3.1, 4.1)

(2) Sentient object groups are differentiated. Of the five sentient object groups considered, only Parents and People in General are poorly differentiated by respondents. To others are assigned distinct patterns of cognitions by respondents. (2.8, 3.2, 4.2)

(3) School Officials are most unreasonable in norms and expectations for teachers. Community and student respondents alike agree that School Officials are most disparate from themselves of all sentient object groups studied. (3.3, 4.3)

(4) Cognitive signs agree. The signs of all significant differences between own and attributed cognitions agree so that positive norms and expectations always show the same sign, while negative norms are always disparate from the former two. (3.6, 4.6)

(5) Cognitive slop-over exists. There is considerable evidence from a number of sources to show that all three types of cognitions are strongly related for respondents. (2.2, 3.7, 4.7)

(6) Cognitive types are unique. There is also evidence, however, to show that all three types of cognitions have their unique functions for respondents. (2.1, 3.7, 4.7)

(7) Public expects teacher conformity. From both the Pilot and Role Studies we learn that People in General not only want but also expect more teacher conformity to principles of shared morality, according to respondents. (2.5 and various findings from Chapters III and IV, especially 3.16 and 4.17).

Differences

(1) Numbers of significant differences by type of cognition. In the Pilot Study there were more significant differences between own and attributed norms than expectations (2.3), while in the Role Study expectational differences predominated (3.5) or there were no differences in numbers (4.5).

(2) Activity level desired and expected. The Pilot Study showed a desire and expectation by sentient object groups for less activity on the part of teachers (2.4), while the Role Study assigned a desire and expectation for more activity to all except Teachers (3.4, 4.4).

(3) Similarity of Teachers. In the Pilot Study, Teachers are seen as holding no fewer cognitive distortions than other sentient object groups (2.11) while in the Role Study Teachers are seen as being more similar to respondents in expectations and norms held (3.3, 4.3).

(4) Teacher-others role conflict. Community respondents see Teacher norms (and to a certain extent expectations) as running counter to those of People in General and School Officials (3.8) while Students see no such pattern of differences (2.2, 4.8).

(5) Size of cognitive disparities. Students see cognitive disparities between themselves and others of a greater size than do community respondents, particularly in negative norms. (Chapters III and IV, especially Tables 3.3, 3.5 and 4.4)

(6) Normative extremes. Student respondents in the Pilot Study maintained a group of normatively extreme teacher characteristics which they approved or disapproved more strongly than they saw others as doing (2.6) while sentient object groups were seen as ignorant of actual teacher characteristics which are unlikely (2.7). Respondents also did not themselves maintain strong norms about teacher entrance into community settings, although they felt that others (except College Students) did so (2.12), and that the same others also were unreasonably optimistic about teacher entrance into disapproved places (2.13). Such findings did not appear

General Findings. It is clear from findings that distinct, gross and patterned differences exist between the role of public school teacher held by respondents and the roles attributed to various persons for teachers. These differences suggest that in future investigations an assumption of equality between own and attributed roles should be avoided. Findings also support the proposition that persons are most likely to attribute their own cognitions (particularly their own expectations) to members of a sentient object group to which they belong ("Students" in the Pilot Study), less likely to attribute their own cognitions to sentient others who are members of the target position ("Teachers"), and grossly less likely to attribute their own cognitions to members of the public or to persons who hold positions of authority over members of the target position.

We also find evidence of a considerable interactive effect (or cognitive slop-over) between expectations, positive and negative norms held and attributed for teachers. Where respondents see others as holding significantly disparate cognitions from their own, the differences are always consonant in sign, with positive norms and expectations generally coinciding, while negative norms are disparate in sign from both. And yet, there is also considerable evidence for the independent existence and utility of all three types of cognition.

Finally, there is considerable evidence that, for all respondents, the "public image" of the teacher is one of conformity - an image, by the way, which is not shared by respondents, particularly by college students. Of all sentient object groups, the worst distorters of norms and expectations for teachers are the School Officials. Such persons are seen by respondents as restrictive and demanding of teachers. And the only condition which makes for tolerable living conditions for the teacher (according to respondents) is that School Officials also hold distorted expectations for teacher conformity to their wishes.

Figure 5.2--Findings for Students as Sentient Objects

Similarities

Differences

(1) Students are seen as holding conservative values. The norms which are attributed to Students by student respondents are unreasonably (and falsely) conservative. (2.10) This finding also is more true for normatively extreme teacher characteristics.

(2) Students are seen as holding no disparate expectations. Student respondents see Students as holding expectations which are not significantly different from their own. (2.11)

Figure 5.3--Findings for Teachers as Sentient Objects

Similarities

(1) Disparities exist. Respondents see Teachers as not only differing from themselves in norms for teacher characteristics and behavior but also as holding (necessarily) false expectations. (2.11, Tables 3.2 and 4.2).

(2) Agreement with others on control. Teachers are seen by respondents to agree with School Officials and People in General in the desirability for and expectation of more teacher control and discipline of pupils, but these effects for Teachers are of smaller magnitude than for the other sentient object groups. (3.9, 4.10)

(3) Teachers are pro-self-indulgence. Teachers are seen by respondents as wanting and to a lesser extent expecting self-indulgent behaviors. (3.12, 4.13)

(4) Teachers disapprove community participation. Respondents see that (for selected areas) Teachers disapprove of participation in community activities. (3.15, 4.18)

Differences

(1) Amount of activity. Student respondents see Teachers as expecting and wanting more activities of teachers (though not as many as do People in General or School Officials) (4.4). In contrast, no such pattern is assigned to Teachers by community respondents. (3.4)

(2) Threat and discipline. Student respondents attribute the approval of threats and general discipline to Teachers (4.13). No such attributions are made by community respondents.

When we turn to general differences, a number of interesting questions arise. Findings from the Pilot Study showed both a greater number of significant differences for norms than expectations, and many norms and expectations held by others for less activity on the part of teachers. Both of these effects were reversed in the Role Study. It is possible to interpret this difference in terms of the two methods of measuring role cognitions; by strength of cognition in the Pilot Study and by modal position of cognition in the Role Study. However, the authors now believe that these differences are artifactive and resulted from the choice of items in the two studies. It will be recalled that items for the Pilot Study were chosen for normative coverage, whereas items in the Role Study were chosen for likelihood of generating disparities in own cognitions held by various groups of respondents. These two methods have resulted in a large number of strongly disapproved teacher characteristic items in the Pilot Study which are not matched in the Role Study. Such items as:

Drug Addiction
Sexual Immorality
Insobriety
Profanity
Association with Questionable Characters
Liquor and Drug Addiction Clinics
Taverns
Billiard Parlors
Prisons
Race Tracks
Police Stations

and the like, represent a large sector of the public prohibitive morality. In the Pilot Study student respondents attributed to other persons (except Students)

Figure 5.4—Findings for People in General and Parents as Sentient Objects

Similarities

(1) People in General want and expect control and discipline. Respondents see people in general as both wanting and expecting more teacher control and discipline of pupils than do respondents. (3.9, 4.9)

(2) People in General both want and expect community participation. Both students and community members attribute to People in General norms and expectations favoring community participation by teachers. (3.16, 4.17)

(3) People in General want structuring. Respondents feel that People in General want more teacher structuring and direction of pupils. (3.10, 4.15)

Differences

(1) Few differences are seen between People in General and Parents. Norms and expectations attributed to Parents and People in General by student respondents tended to be similar. (2.9)

(2) Naive optimism. Community respondents see People in General as being naively optimistic about teacher encouragement of pupils and community participation by teachers. (3.14) There is less evidence for this finding among student respondents.

(3) Sending to principal. Student respondents see People in General as expecting teachers to send pupils to the principal. (4.12) There is no evidence that community respondents also make this attribution.

(4) Menial tasks. Student respondents see People in General as being unreasonably in favor of teachers doing menial tasks. (4.12) There is no evidence that community respondents also make this attribution.

(5) Singing. Student respondents see People in General as wanting more singing by the teacher than do respondents. (4.16) No significant difference is found for community respondents.

(6) Expectations for structuring. People in General are seen by community respondents as expecting the teacher to structure (3.10) whereas student respondents attribute no such expectations to People in General (even though they share a common attribution of such norms) (4.15).

(7) Teaching-related maintenance functions. Students see People in General as expecting and wanting slightly more teacher performance of teaching-related maintenance functions than they do themselves. (4.20) No such differences appear for the community.

strong and disapproving norms for these and similar items (See Tables 2.1 and 2.2). Removing such items from the original list utilized in the Pilot Study tends to weaken or reverse the dominance of norms and also reverses the finding of others holding desires and expectations for less teacher activity. It may be concluded that, except for teacher characteristics which are broadly disapproved, respondents attribute to others both approval of and expectation for more activity of teachers, while there are some weak tendencies for more expectational rather than normative differences to appear between own and attributed cognitions.

Two other differences between findings of the three studies may be given a more straight forward interpretation. Students tend to see differences between their cognitions for the teacher and those of Teachers, People in General and School Officials as having greater magnitude than do community respondents, while community respondents attribute a greater amount of role conflict between Teachers and School Officials. Neither of these findings is particularly surprising.

Finally, two sets of findings point directly toward differences in the methods used in the Pilot and Role Studies. Few differences are reported between respondents' own cognitions and those of teachers in the Role Study, while Teachers are seen as being not particularly like respondents in the Pilot Study. This may have resulted either from the presence of the "Student" sentient object group in the Pilot Study, thus providing respondents with at least one group to which they might project a reality judgment for their own cognitions, or it may have depended upon the different method of measuring role cognitions used. The other set of findings, which reports a number of effects occurring at extremes of normative assignment, is almost certainly a function of including such items in the Pilot Study.

Figure 5.5--Findings for School Officials as Sentient Objects

Similarities

(1) School Officials want and expect control and discipline. Respondents see School Officials as both wanting and expecting more teacher control and discipline of pupils than do respondents. (3.9, 4.9)

(2) School Officials want structuring. Respondents feel that School Officials want more teacher structuring and direction of pupils than do respondents themselves. (3.10, 4.15)

(3) School Officials desire non-teaching maintenance behavior. Respondents see School Officials as unreasonably wanting teachers to perform non-teaching maintenance functions. (3.17, 4.19)

(4) School Officials expect cooperation. School Officials are seen by respondents as expecting more cooperation with themselves by teachers than do respondents. (3.18, 4.19)

(5) School Officials desire and expect less visiting with other teachers on the playground. Respondents attribute disparate expectations and norms to School Officials about teacher visiting, but only at the playground setting. (3.13, 4.14)

(6) School Officials want deviancy control. Respondents see School Officials as desiring more deviancy control than respondents do, but not expecting more. (3.10, 4.11)

Differences

(1) Control items. Community respondents feel that School Officials are primarily concerned about teacher control and discipline of pupils in areas which involve public policy (3.11), while students see School Official concerns as covering all areas of control (4.9).

(2) Singing. Student respondents see School Officials as wanting more teachers to sing during singing period (4.16) while no such difference is to be found for community respondents.

(3) Expectations for structuring. School Officials are seen by community respondents as expecting the teacher to structure (3.10) whereas student respondents attribute no expectations to School Officials (even though they share a common attribution of such norms) (4.15).

(4) Gratuitous control. School Officials are seen as expecting (but not wanting) more gratuitous controlling of teachers than respondents expect but by student respondents only. (4.14)

(5) Teaching-related maintenance functions. Students see School Officials as expecting and wanting slightly more teacher performance of teaching-related maintenance functions than they do themselves. (4.20) No such differences appear for the community.

(6) Non-teaching maintenance functions. Student respondents see School Officials as expecting more non-teaching maintenance behavior of teachers (4.19), while community respondents do not attribute such expectational distortion (3.17).

Findings for Sentient Object Groups. A variety of differences among treatments given to the five sentient object groups are reported in Figures 5.2 through 5.5, and for a differentiated review, the reader should turn to these figures. Among the findings reported, the following are outstanding:

There were few significant differences between Parents and People in General; and as a result of this finding within the Pilot Study, the investigators eliminated the Parent sentient object group in the Role Study. By implication, all additional findings of "public opinion" held by community and student respondents can also be assumed to be applicable to parents.

People in General are seen by all respondents as wanting and expecting unreasonable amounts of control and discipline by the teacher, as both wanting and expecting community participation by teachers and as wanting teachers to structure activities in the classroom. Various groups of respondents felt that People in General were naively optimistic about teacher behaviors, expected teachers to send students to the principal, wanted teachers to do menial tasks, wanted teachers to sing, expected structuring, and both expected and wanted teacher performance of teaching-related maintenance functions - and in all of these cognitions were disparate from those held by respondents. For respondents as a group, then, People in General are seen as restrictive, disciplinary, in favor of structure, and in general quite misinformed about actual teacher behavior. Community respondents see People in General as more naive and desirous of structuring. Student respondents see People in General as more restrictive and desirous of teachers doing unreasonable things.

The patterns of responses given to School Officials is very similar to that given to People in General - only more so! School Officials also want teachers to control and to discipline, to maintain order, to cooperate, to avoid visiting, and to control deviants. What is worse, they hold non-veridical expectations that teachers do just these things! And, once again, community respondents see School Officials as more in favor of control in areas involving "public policy" and structure, while student respondents find School Officials as demanding control on a general basis, as wanting teacher performance of all sorts of maintenance functions, as expecting more teacher control in gratuitous areas, and the like. Student respondents, then, spread out broadly the base of School Official concerns and distortions. Community respondents confine the disparate interests of School Officials to fewer areas of interest, but in those areas they see a sharper set of distinctions between teacher desires which are often seen to run counter to those of School Officials.

The biggest surprise in respondents' treatment of Teachers as a sentient object is to note the large number of disparate expectations attributed by respondents to Teachers. If Teachers do not know what teachers do, then who does? Two explanations of this finding suggest themselves. First of all, respondents may feel that the individual teacher is not a good judge of what teachers-in-general may be doing because he experiences only a limited range of teacher activities and is influenced by his own needs and values. Secondly, it is also possible that respondents may misinterpret the concept of "expectation" to imply a kind of forcing as in "He will do so-and-so." For instance, the rather striking finding that School Officials expect, but do not necessarily want, a good deal of teacher performance of gratuitous control (according to respondents) may possibly reflect respondents' assignment of a feeling that such behaviors are seen as functional necessity by School Officials, whereas the respondents (who are sophisticated college students) know that teachers often do not control pupils in such settings. Applying such an interpretation to Teacher expectational disparities, respondents may feel that Teachers see a necessity for certain kinds of behavior, hence distortingly "expect" that those behaviors will be done.

The two most prominent areas of disparities in cognitions attributed to Teachers are those of self-indulgence and community participation. It is no surprise to discover that respondents feel that Teachers want to be self-indulgent and want to avoid community participation. It is a bit more surprising to discover that college student respondents see Teachers as wanting and expecting more activity of teachers than respondents do themselves and attribute to Teachers the approval of threats and general discipline. Apart from hostility towards School Officials, college student respondents are also revealed as intolerant of Teachers - in contrast with community respondents.

Finally, as a sentient object group, College Students are seen by college student respondents as holding conservative normative positions (1) and as holding *not one expectation* which is significantly disparate from those given by respondents.

Differences among Types of Cognition. It was hoped that in this study (and the others related to it) that a pattern of differences between expectations and positive and negative norms would be revealed. This pattern is difficult to spot on a general level, but a number of more particularistic findings in this study are highly suggestive.

It would seem, for instance, that little evidence exists in any of the three studies reported to suggest a dominance of norms or expectations in size of disparities, number of items covered, or number of significant differences. There is a strong positive correlation between all reported positive norms and expectations, and no reported negative norms are ever seen as coincidental with expectations or as showing own-attributed differences which are similar in sign to those of positive norms or expectations.

On the other hand: (1) Findings exist which show that positive and negative norms may be independently useful as measures; that one may show significant differences when the other does not. It has also been suggested that this phenomenon depends upon the structure of shared prohibitions or allowances for behavior. (2) Findings exist to show that expectations and positive (or negative) norms may also exhibit independence; that sentient objects may be seen to differ with consistency from oneself in either without necessarily implying the other. (3) The structures of all three types of cognition have been shown to relate to: Type of content area, sentient object group involved, respondent group involved, and teacher characteristic. It remains to be seen what effects (if any) these differentiated types of cognitions may be shown to have upon the behavior of respondents.

Teacher Characteristics. Only one or two findings are available (from the Pilot Study) on differences among the three types of teacher characteristics considered--Behaviors, Traits and Entrance into Community Settings. In general, the behavioral and trait data were similar in patterns of own and attributed cognitions; but the settings data were quite distinct. College student respondents felt, personally, quite neutral about the sheer presence of teachers in such locations as slums or police stations. But they felt that others--for whatever reasons the teacher might be there--would be disturbed to find teachers in such locations. In addition, students also attributed expectations for teacher non-entrance into setting to others, while they themselves felt that teachers would be found in such places from time to time. In retrospect it is a shame that we do not have data on whether community respondents do (as students feel they do) hold prohibitive norms regarding teacher presence in settings. If community respondents should share this additional prejudice of students, chalk up one more strike against the "public image" of the teacher and indeed against the shared image of "the public."

Respondent Groups. It is easy to summarize differences between community and student groups as respondents. Students tended to see larger differences between themselves and others in cognitions held for the teacher, were convinced that School Officials were both oppressive of teachers and distorted in their expectations, were convinced that People in General were prejudiced and also mistaken about many expectations for teachers (although less so than School Officials), and were generally intolerant of the values and standards of teachers. Community respondents, in contrast, saw smaller differences, were convinced of fewer areas of School Official oppression and expectational distortion, saw People in General as being nearly as much (and sometimes more) desirous and autistic in expectations for teachers, were more tolerant of teachers, and saw role conflict between the values of School Officials and Teachers which was not seen by students.

Content Areas of Teacher Role. It is difficult to generalize from the small and distorted samples of content areas applying to teacher role represented by the 150 items used in the two study forms. Nevertheless: (1) A great number of disparities seen by respondents between themselves and others concerns issues of pupil control and discipline. (2) Additional and persistent topics are self-indulgence and community participation. (3) Finally, student respondents, at least, are convinced that others hold genuinely distorted norms and expectations regarding teacher performance in the area of general, prohibitive morality. Within each of these broad areas--and several others less prominent--distinct patterns of differences between respondents' own cognitions and those they attribute to others for teachers may be found.

Measuring Instrument Differences. We have the least to report concerning differences between the two methods of measuring cognitions: (1) the strength of cognition method used in the Pilot Study and (2) the modal position method used in the Role Study. Both generate differences beyond chance probability; both give differentiated results; both are easy to administer and for respondents to understand; and both are inadequate if judged against the criterion of measuring the total envelope of the cognitive distribution held by a respondent.

Those differences which may depend upon distinctions in measuring technique--as for instance the finding that Teachers are seen as similar to People in General in the Pilot Study--may also be a function of items and characteristics chosen for study, samples of respondents, or other conditions of the interviewing session.

Implications of the Results

For Role Theory. Although structured as a field study, the investigators initiated the reported research with two general hypotheses in mind:

(1) Norms are a more central, more strongly held, surer type of cognition than expectations; hence there should be more differences between own and attributed norms than between own and attributed expectations.

(2) G. H. Mead 20/ has suggested that a "Generalized Other" exists for persons which consists of a general sentient object group from whom persons draw their own cognitions; hence there should be more similarity between respondents' own cognitions and cognitions they attribute to People in General than for other sentient object groups.

Needless to say, neither hypothesis has received overwhelming support. If anything, there is evidence of a greater number of expectational differences. And if a "Generalized Other" should exist for respondents who hold similar norms and expectations, the "other" is certainly not operationalized by the words "People in General" or indeed by any of the other sentient object groups studied.

What conclusions, then, may we state for role theory? What tentative propositions appear in these data which should receive subsequent and detailed experimental verification? Although deliberately generalized beyond these findings and not yet organized into a related system of propositions, the following statements constitute a beginning:

(1) For approved and stable positions (such as that of teacher) and except for cases of extreme role conflict, expectations and positive norms will agree and will be disparate from negative norms.

(2) There will be fewer disparities between negative own norms and attributed negative norms for content areas where a wide range of allowable behaviors exist. Conversely, there will be fewer positive norm disparities where a narrow range of allowable behaviors exist.

(3) Respondents will tend to attribute few disparate expectations to sentient object groups of which they are members.

(4) Respondents will attribute fewer normative and expectational disparities to members of a target position (as sentient object others judging characteristics of persons in that position) than they will to members of other positions in a social system or to the public.

(5) The closer a sentient object position is to either (a) the respondent, or (b) the target, the fewer disparities will the respondent attribute to that position.

(6) The larger the presumptive size of a sentient object position, the more stereotypic the cognitions attributed to that position by respondents.

(7) In American society, persons will attribute conservatism, innocence, autism, restrictiveness, and support of standard principles of morality to People in General or "the public" for members of approved target positions, while respondents themselves support and expect less of these characteristics of target persons.

(8) In American society, persons will attribute conservatism and support of standard principles of morality (but not autism or innocence) to sentient object positions of which they are members.

(9) Because of the differences between own norms (and expectations) and those attributed—however falsely—to "the public," respondents will tend to utilize two disparate standards for their own behavior. The first standard, based upon their own norms and expectations, they will apply to private situations where they must judge and react to the behavior of a target person

as a private individual. The second standard, based upon the norms and expectations which they presume others hold (and which all respondents presume others hold), they will apply to public situations where they must judge and react to the behavior of a target person as a "representative" of the public.

(10) The closer a respondent is to a functioning social institution, the more able he is to discern role conflict within that institution in the form of disparate cognitions held for the behavior of a target position in the institution held by various members of the institution.

(11) The further a respondent is from a functioning social institution, the more stereotypic will be his attributions of cognitions to members of that institution, the more disparate he will see his cognitions from those of members of the institution, and the more content areas he will include in the stereotypes he holds.

(12) Respondents in American society will attribute to others (and particularly "the public") norms and expectations for greater activity on the part of target persons in positions of public trust in areas of their direct responsibility, norms and expectations which respondents do not necessarily share.

(13) Members of a target position which is sandwiched within an institutional hierarchy will be seen as wanting and expecting to avoid onerous duties and to favor self-indulgence by target position members.

(14) Respondents will attribute to the bosses of members of a target position desires and expectations for public conformity to the requirements of onerous duties and avoidance of self-indulgence.

(15) Respondents will attribute to the bosses of target persons in a position of public trust a support of cognitions which they also attribute to "the public."

(16) Respondents will attribute to the bosses of all target persons the expectation for cooperation from target persons, even if the respondent does not share such expectations.

(17) Respondents will attribute to the bosses of all target persons the desires for target persons performing those behaviors which are seen as desirable for institutional functioning, even if neither respondents nor bosses expect such behaviors.

For the Role of the Teacher. Implications of these findings for teacher role are both old and new. Among the former: We have shown that a "public" expectation of teacher conformity exists, that teachers are seen to be in some conflict with their superiors (but that not much role conflict exists in the school), that teachers are both desired and expected (by all) to conform to the standards of a public morality. These insights are obviously not new and certainly do not constitute an excuse for the research. On the other hand, a number of findings have appeared which apply to the role of the public school teacher and which are not at all obvious. Among these are:

(1) There exist startling and persistent disparities between roles for the teacher held by respondents and attributed (mistakenly) by respondents to others. Moreover, according to our respondents, School Officials take note of and are the representatives of the "public" and mistaken role. This suggests that many persons operate on two levels with regard to judgments made about the public school teacher, a private and public one. When a school official, for instance, interacts with a teacher in a situation structured as "private," he may be able to apply standards for conduct which he, himself, holds. On the other hand, when the situation is "public," he will be likely to utilize standards which he attributes (however incorrectly) to "the public."

(2) The persistence of strongly disparate norms attributed to School Officials poses a problem for the school as a functioning institution. How can teachers and school officials operate with such disparate norms and still interact peacefully and efficiently? According to respondents, because School Officials also do not know what is going on! Whether because of needs, of

cognitive slop-over, or as a result of built-in deception within the system, respondents see the school as a social system operating within the structure of disparate norms precisely because school officials are not adequately oriented in their expectations for teacher behavior.

(3) There is little evidence that respondents are adequately aware of the complexity of teacher reactions to PTA and community participation. Respondents feel that People in General want and expect teacher participation more than is reasonable, whereas Teachers are felt to disapprove community participation. These differences, however, are mild and do not reflect the complexities of actual teacher feelings.

(4) Community members are discriminably sensitive to role conflict in the school system as represented by disparate norms and expectations attributed to Teachers and School Officials. This awareness suggests a sophistication and concern which may be turned to goodusе.

(5) In contrast, student respondents are less aware of role conflict, are more convinced of the oppressive and distorted character of role cognitions held by school officials, and are less tolerant of teachers in general. This is particularly distressing when we consider that approximately half of the student respondents in the Role Study were education majors. If young people are to be recruited into the teaching profession in terms of the images they hold for teachers and for those with whom teachers are in interaction, what kinds of young people will we recruit with such a distorted image?

(6) Finally, the "public" and mistaken role of the teacher, consisting of those disparate norms and expectations which are attributed by respondents to others, is one of considerable restriction if not prudery and one which emphasizes teacher control, discipline, and structuring for pupils. It is implied that a great deal of relief might be bought for the American school teacher by conducting a public campaign to educate both school officials and

the community as to what actually constitutes the norms and expectations which were held for teachers. One of the common complaints of teachers is the "indefinite extension of responsibility" which a teacher must bear both in and out of school. We now can see a major source of this problem: The mistaken attribution of restrictive norms and expectations to a "public" which no longer holds them--if indeed it ever did. To destroy this myth would at one stroke: (a) Allow the teacher to restrict his realm of responsibilities to the realities of norms and expectations actually held by community members, and (b) Would raise the attractiveness of the teaching profession for potential teachers.

Recommendations

To suggest that additional explorations are needed in verification of these tentative conclusions is to state only the obvious. Too painfully: Our samples were limited, the data were gathered in but a single, metropolitan area, the techniques used require extensive modification, insufficient coverage was obtained of content areas of the teacher role, and many other short-comings limit the usefulness of the results.

It is reasonable, however, to suggest a priority upon any investigations which should in some sense follow these. First of all, we would suggest that interested readers become familiar with the collateral findings reported in other volumes of this series. An integrated set of concerns, terms, concepts, and methods was used to investigate a number of aspects of teacher role; and findings from other volumes will be found to supplement those reported here.

Secondly, we hope that deliberate attempts are made to replicate these findings in other communities using refined instruments and techniques. Of great usefulness would be a study of teacher role using a national sample. Another worth-while type of replication would be to test these findings within a comparable, Western European society.

Thirdly, should these results and interpretations—especially for teacher role—prove to have some validity, we would hope that they served to stimulate efforts by interested persons and groups to rectify the social problems discussed here. Particularly, if indeed there exists a false consensus as to what the "public" wants and expects for teachers, it seems to us that campaigns of information directed at both the schools themselves and the public could do much to relieve pressures upon the teacher and to encourage recruitment into the teaching profession.

Finally, those propositions for role theory which are stated here are capable of experimental application in other contexts. It is hoped that others (and ourselves) will seek to test them utilizing other data, other positions, other respondents, other methods; and that, if further supported, such propositions will eventually be worked into a logico-deductive propositional structure for role theory.

REFERENCES

1. Lewis, Elizabeth Voss. "Pupil Expectations of Student-Teacher Behavior in Certain Selected Classroom Situations," Dissertation Abstracts, Vol. 6, 1956, 2097-2098.

2. Fishburn, Clarence E. "Teacher Role Perception in the Secondary Schools of One Community," Dissertation Abstracts, Vol. 15, 1955, 1798-1799.

3. McGill, K. H. "The School Teacher Stereotype," Journal of Educational Sociology, Vol. 4, 1931, 642-650.

4. Yourglich, Anita. "Study on Correlations Between College Teachers and Students' Concepts of 'Ideal Student' and 'Ideal Teacher'," Journal of Educational Research, Vol. 49, 1955, 59-74.

5. Callaway, Albert B. "Some Environmental Influences that are Brought to Bear upon the Lives of Missouri Teachers and Administrators," Microfilm Abstracts, Vol. 11, No. 3, 554-555.

6. Cook, et al. "Teacher and Community Relations," American Sociological Review, Vol. 3, 1938, 167-174.

7. Lane, Willard R. "The Induction of Beginning Teachers in Wisconsin Public Schools," Unpublished Doctoral Thesis, University of Wisconsin, 1951.

8. Manwiller, L. V. "Expectations Regarding Teachers," Journal of Experimental Education, Vol. 26, 315-354.

9. Biddle, B. J., et al. Studies in the Role of the Public School Teacher. Vol. A: "Role Theory and Methods of Role Analysis"; University of Missouri: Social Psychology Laboratory, 1961.

10. Barker, Roger G., and Wright, Herbert F. Midwest and Its Children. Evanston: Row, Peterson, 1954.

11. Festinger, Leon. A Theory of Cognitive Dissonance. Evanston: Row, Peterson, 1957.

12. Biddle, B. J., et al. Studies in the Role of the Public School Teacher. Vol. B: "Bibliographies on Role Terms, Role Conflict, and the Role of the Teacher," University of Missouri: Social Psychology Laboratory, 1961.

13. Allport, Floyd. Social Psychology. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1924.

14. Schanck, R. C. "A Study of a Community and its Groups and Institutions Conceived of as Behaviors of Individuals," Psychological Monographs, 1932.

15. Biddle, B. J., et al. Studies in the Role of the Public School Teacher. Vol. 1: "Orientation, Methods and Materials"; University of Missouri: Social Psychology Laboratory, 1961.

16. ———. *Studies in the Role of the Public School Teacher*. Vol. 2: "General Characteristics of the School Teacher's Role"; University of Missouri: Social Psychology Laboratory, 1961.

17. ———. *Studies in the Role of the Public School Teacher*. Vol. C: "A Program for the Processing of Ordinal Data and Computation of Significance for Selected Central Tendency Differences"; University of Missouri: Social Psychology Laboratory, 1961.

18. ———. *Studies in the Role of the Public School Teacher*. Vol. 3: "Positional Differences in Teacher Role"; University of Missouri: Social Psychology Laboratory, 1961.

19. ———. *Studies in the Role of the Public School Teacher*. Vol. 4: "Role of the Teacher and Occupational Choice"; University of Missouri: Social Psychology Laboratory, 1961.

20. Mead, G. H. *Mind, Self and Society*. (Posthumous: C. M. Morris, Ed.) Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1934.